arXiv:1610.03912v2 [math.DG] 15 Nov 2016

NORMAL SCALAR CURVATURE INEQUALITY ON THE FOCAL SUBMANIFOLDS OF ISOPARAMETRIC HYPERSURFACES

JIANQUAN GE, ZIZHOU TANG, AND WENJIAO YAN†

Abstract. An isoparametric hypersurface in unit spheres has two focal submanifolds. Condition A plays a crucial role in the classification theory of isoparametric hypersurfaces in [CCJ07], [Chi16] and [Miy13]. This paper determines C_A, the set of points with Condition A in focal submanifolds. It turns out that the points in C_A reach an upper bound of the normal scalar curvature $\rho^\perp$ (sharper than that in DDVV inequality [GT08], [Lu11]). We also determine the sets C_P (points with parallel second fundamental form) and C_E (points with Einstein condition), which achieve two lower bounds of $\rho^\perp$.

1. Introduction

A smooth function $f : N \to \mathbb{R}$ defined on a Riemannian manifold N is called *isoparametric* (cf.[Wan87],[GT13],[QT15]), if there exist a smooth function $b : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and a continuous function $a : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} |\nabla f|^2 = b(f), \\ \Delta f \ = a(f), \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where ∇f, Δf are the gradient and Laplacian of f, respectively. The regular level sets of f are called isoparametric hypersurfaces in N, while the singular ones (if exist) are called the focal varieties, which are smooth submanifolds of N. For $N = S^{n+1}(1)$, a well-known result of E. Cartan states that an isoparametric hypersurface in $S^{n+1}(1)$ is nothing but a hypersurface with constant principal curvatures. Without loss of generality, suppose now that Image$(f) = [-1, 1]$. The focal varieties of f, $M_+ =: f^{-1}(+1)$ and $M_- =: f^{-1}(-1)$, are connected, minimal submanifolds of $S^{n+1}(1)$ (cf. [CR85]).

Quite recently, the classification of isoparametric hypersurfaces in $S^{n+1}(1)$ was accomplished by Miyaoka and Chi. This settles S.T.Yau's 34th problem in [Yau82].

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 53C12, 53C20, 53C40.

Key words and phrases. Isoparametric hypersurfaces, focal submanifolds, Condition A, parallel second fundamental form, Einstein condition.

† the corresponding author.

The project is partially supported by the NSFC (No.11331002, 11301027, 11522103) and SRFDP (No. 20130003120008) .

To be more precise, let g be the number of distinct principal curvatures with multiplicity m_i $(i = 1, \cdots, g)$. According to [Mün80, 81], g can be only $1, 2, 3, 4$ or 6, and $m_i = m_{i+2}$ (subscripts mod g). When $g = 1, 2, 3$ and 6, the isoparametric hypersurfaces are homogeneous (cf. [DN85], [Miy13], [Miy16]); when $g = 4$, the isoparametric hypersurfaces are either of OT-FKM type (defined later), or homogeneous with $(m_1, m_2) = (2, 2), (4, 5)$ (cf. [CCJ07], [Chi13], [Chi16]). In these papers towards the classification problem, the Condition A always plays a very important role in the approach (cf. [Chi12]).

The geometric meaning of Condition A is that at some point in a focal submanifold, the kernels of all second fundamental tensors (shape operators) coincide (cf. [OT75]). It is actually satisfied everywhere on each focal submanifold when $g = 1, 2, 3$ and 6. The proofs are straightforward for the former three cases but far from trivial for $g = 6$ (cf. [Miy93], [Miy13]). In fact, Condition A is usually used to detect the homogeneity and inhomogeneity. By using delicate isoparametric triple system, [DN83] succeeded in classifying all the isoparametric hypersurfaces with $g = 4$, on which Condition A is fulfilled (on one focal submanifold). Translating their language of isoparametric triple systems into a plainer form, one has

Theorem ([DN83]**)** *On the focal submanifolds of isoparametric hypersurfaces in $S^{n+1}(1)$ with $g = 4$, there are points satisfying Condition A on and only on the following:*

(1). *The focal submanifolds M_+ of OT-FKM type with $(m_1, m_2) = (1, k), (3, 4k)$ and $(7, 8k)$ $(k \geq 1)$;*
(2). *The focal submanifolds M_- of OT-FKM type with $(m_1, m_2) = (4, 3)$ and $(8, 7)$;*
(3). *The focal submanifold diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}P^3$ with $(m_1, m_2) = (2, 2)$.*[1]

Here comes a natural question: which points on these focal submanifolds satisfy Condition A ? Given an isoparametric hypersurface in $S^{n+1}(1)$ with $g = 4$, we define the set

$$C_A =: \{\text{the points satisfying Condition A}\}.$$

As one of the main purposes of this paper, we aim at determining C_A for all the focal submanifolds mentioned in the theorem above. Here we should point out that [DN83'] gave a partial answer to this question in M_- of OT-FKM type with multiplicities $(4, 3)$ and $(8, 7)$. In fact, they found subsets of C_A in M_- under an additional assumption that the point is an eigenvector of the fixed Clifford matrix P_0.

Next, let's explain the Condition A in a more accurate way. On a focal submanifold M_+ with $g = 4$ and codimension $m_1 + 1$ in $S^{n+1}(1)$, it is well known that the shape

[1] In $(2, 2)$ case, one focal submanifold is diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}P^3$ and the other diffeomorphic to $\widetilde{G}_2(\mathbb{R}^5)$ (cf. [QTY13]). In fact, [DN83] and [OT76] didn't point out which one of, or whether both of the focal submanifolds satisfy Condition A. This will be determined in this paper by using the normal scalar curvature inequalities (1.5, 1.7).

operator associated with any unit normal vector has eigenvalues $+1$, -1 and 0 with multiplicities m_2, m_2 and m_1, respectively (as for M_-, replace the corresponding multiplicities m_1, m_2 with m_2, m_1). Let $\{n_\alpha,\ \alpha = 0, 1, \cdots, m_1\}$ be an orthonormal basis of the normal space $T_x^\perp M_+$. Following [OT75], we denote by V_+, V_- and V_0 the eigenspaces of the shape operator in the normal direction n_0 associated with the eigenvalues 1, -1 and 0, respectively. With this understood, the shape operators $S_\alpha =: S_{n_\alpha}$ $(0 \le \alpha \le m_1)$, upon certain fixing orthonormal basis $\{e_1, \cdots, e_{m_1+2m_2}\}$ of T_xM_+, can be written as:

$$S_0 = \begin{pmatrix} I_{m_2} & & \\ & -I_{m_2} & \\ & & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad S_\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A_\alpha & B_\alpha \\ A_\alpha^t & 0 & C_\alpha \\ B_\alpha^t & C_\alpha^t & 0 \end{pmatrix}, 1 \le \alpha \le m_1, \tag{1.2}$$

where $A_\alpha : V_- \to V_+$, $B_\alpha : V_0 \to V_+$ and $C_\alpha : V_0 \to V_-$. Then a point $x \in M_+$ is of Condition A if and only if $B_\alpha = C_\alpha = 0$ for all $1 \le \alpha \le m_1$.

Moreover, we find an interesting phenomenon that Condition A can be alternatively characterized by the normal scalar curvature (function) inequality on the focal submanifolds. In fact, the normal scalar curvature (function) achieves an upper bound at the points satisfying Condition A, and this upper bound is sharper than that in the DDVV (normal scalar curvature) inequality.

Recall that the normal scalar curvature of $M_+^{m_1+2m_2}$ in $S^{2m_1+2m_2+1}(1)$ can be defined as (slightly different from that in [DDVV99])

$$\rho^\perp =: \sum_{\alpha,\beta=0}^{m_1} \|[S_\alpha, S_\beta]\|^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^{m_1+2m_2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta=0}^{m_1} \langle R^\perp(e_i, e_j)n_\alpha, n_\beta\rangle^2 = \|R^\perp\|^2, \tag{1.3}$$

where $R^\perp$ is the normal curvature tensor. We remark that the second equality above follows from the Gauss and Ricci equations. Notice that the squared norm of the second fundamental form S is constant on the focal submanifolds, more precisely, $\|S\|^2 = 2m_2(m_1 + 1)$ on M_+ $(g = 4)$, (resp. $2m_1(m_2 + 1)$ on M_-). By the minimality of focal submanifolds in $S^{n+1}(1)$, the DDVV inequality on M_+ (resp. M_- with (m_1, m_2) interchanged) ($g = 4$ for example) can be transformed into (cf. [DDVV99], [GT08], [Lu11])

$$\rho^\perp \ \le \ 4m_2^2(m_1 + 1)^2. \tag{1.4}$$

Similarly, it is not difficult to obtain the corresponding forms of the DDVV inequality on focal submanifolds with $g \neq 4$. Generally speaking, the submanifolds in space forms whose normal scalar curvature achieves the equality of the DDVV inequality everywhere (the so-called Wintgen ideal submanifolds) are still unclassified, although many partial results and studies are available in the literature (cf. [CL08], [DT09], [XLMW14], etc.). When restricted to the focal submanifolds of isoparametric hypersurfaces in unit spheres, the DDVV inequality hardly achieves the equality even at a point. Fortunately,

by the pointwise equality condition of the DDVV inequality and the special properties of the shape operators of focal submanifolds, we find two examples of the Wintgen ideal submanifolds:

Proposition 1.1. *On the focal submanifolds of isoparametric hypersurfaces in* $\mathbb{S}^{n+1}(1)$*, the DDVV inequality achieves equality (everywhere) on and only on:*

(1). $M_+ \cong M_- \cong \mathbb{R}P^2 \subset \mathbb{S}^4$ *in the case of* $g = 3$*,* $(m_1, m_2) = (1, 1)$*;*
(2). $M_+ \cong SO(3) \subset \mathbb{S}^5$ *in the OT-FKM type of* $g = 4$*,* $(m_1, m_2) = (1, 1)$*.*

We leave the proof to readers, although the proof of "*only on*" is not trivial (one can either calculate directly by using the properties of the OT-FKM type, or simply compare with the classification of C_A and C_P in Theorem 1.1 below). It should be remarked that [XLMW14] studied the Möbius geometry of three dimensional Wintgen ideal submanifolds in $S^5(1)$, and the second example in the proposition above is exactly theirs.

Next, using the formulas (1.2, 1.3), we shall derive the following new normal scalar curvature inequalities on the focal submanifold M_+ (resp. M_- with (m_1, m_2) interchanged):

$$2m_1m_2(m_1+1) \ \le \ \rho^\perp \ \le \ 8m_1m_2(m_1+1). \tag{1.5}$$

Notice that the upper bound in (1.5) is shaper than that in the DDVV inequality (1.4). We shall prove later that this upper bound can be reached exactly at points of Condition A, whose set was denoted by C_A as before. On the other hand, the first equality in (1.5) holds at points with parallel second fundamental form. We define

$$C_P =: \{\text{the points with parallel second fundamental form}\}.$$

In Section 2, we will express the normal scalar curvature $\rho^\perp$ in an alternative way as

$$\rho^\perp = 6\|\sum_{\alpha=0}^{m_1} S_\alpha^2\|^2 - 4m_2(m_1+1)(m_1+3). \tag{1.6}$$

Then using Schwartz inequality, we obtain a sharper lower bound for $\rho^\perp$ on M_+ (resp. M_- with (m_1, m_2) interchanged):

$$\rho^\perp \geq 2m_1m_2(m_1+1) + \frac{6m_1m_2(m_1+1)}{2m_2+m_1}(2m_2 - m_1 - 2), \tag{1.7}$$

where the equality holds at points of Einstein condition, i.e., the Ricci curvature is constant at that point. We denote

$$C_E =: \{\text{the points with constant Ricci curvature in all tangent directions }\}.$$

Summarizing all the estimates above, and combining with the results in [TY15], [QTY13] and [LZ16], we are able to prove the following theorem, determining all the sets C_A, C_P and C_E.

Theorem 1.1. *Let M_+ (resp. M_-) be a focal submanifold of an isoparametric hypersurface with $g = 4$ and codimension $m_1 + 1$ (resp. $m_2 + 1$) in $S^{n+1}(1)$. Then we have the normal scalar curvature inequalities (1.5) and (1.7) on M_+ (resp. M_-). The following Table 1 and 2 give all the sets C_A, C_P and C_E in M_+ and M_-. The first equality in (1.5) holds on and only on C_P, the second one in (1.5) holds on and only on C_A, and the equality in (1.7) holds on and only on C_E. Here, except for $(2, 2)$, all multiplicities (m_1, m_2) stand for $(m, l - m - 1)$ in OT-FKM type; D and I are short for definite and indefinite. $\Omega_k =: (S^k \times S^7)/\mathbb{Z}_2$, for convenience.*

TABLE 1. On the focal submanifold M_+

	$(1,k)$	$(2,1)$	$(6,1)$	$(3,4k)$	$(4,3)D$	$(7,8k)$	$(2,2)$	*others*
C_A	M_+	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$S^{3+4k} \sqcup S^{3+4k}$	$\emptyset$	$\Omega_k \sqcup \Omega_k$	$\mathbb{C}P^3$	$\emptyset$
C_P	$\emptyset$	M_+	M_+	$\emptyset$	M_+	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
C_E	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	M_+	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$

TABLE 2. On the focal submanifold M_-

	$(1,k)$	$(2,1)$	$(6,1)$	$(4,3)D$	$(4,3)I$	$(8,7)D$	$(8,7)I$	$(2,2)$	*others*
C_A	$\emptyset$	M_-	M_-	M_-	$S^7 \sqcup S^7$	$(S^1 \times S^{15})/\mathbb{Z}_2$	$S^{15} \sqcup S^{15}$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$
C_P	M_-	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\widetilde{G}_2(\mathbb{R}^5)$	$\emptyset$
C_E	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\emptyset$	$\widetilde{G}_2(\mathbb{R}^5)$	$\emptyset$

Remark 1.1. *According to Theorem 6.5 in* [FKM81]*, the isoparametric families of OT-FKM type with multiplicities* $(2, 1)$*,* $(6, 1)$ *are congruent to those with multiplicities* $(1, 2)$*,* $(1, 6)$*; The indefinite* $(4, 3)$ *family is congruent to the* $(3, 4)$ *family. Therefore, there are some coincidences of the sets C_A, C_P and C_E in Tables 1 and 2.*

Remark 1.2. *For $g = 3$, as it is well known, the focal submanifolds are Veronese embeddings of projective planes $\mathbb{F}P^2$, $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{O}$, thus they are Einstein. Moreover, they are examples of symmetric R-spaces (*[KT68]*), and thus have parallel second fundamental form. As a result, $C_P = C_E = M_\pm$. For $g = 6$, all focal submanifolds have non-vanishing covariant derivative of second fundamental form (*[LZ16]*) and are not Einstein (*[Xie15]*), thus $C_P = C_E = \emptyset$ by the homogeneity (*[DN85, Miy13]*). So far we have determined all the three sets where the normal scalar curvature inequalities (1.5, 1.7) reach equality for any isoparametric hypersurface in unit spheres. Conversely, if one could prove directly that the normal scalar curvature function achieves its maximum at some point in the inequality (1.5), then the isoparametric hypersurfaces with $g = 4$ are of OT-FKM type or with multiplicities $(2, 2)$. In particular, this approach would provide a new geometric proof for the the last classified case $(7, 8)$ done by* [Chi16]*,*

where deep algebraic geometry method was developed (see for a detailed discussion in [Chi15]*).*

Next we introduce the isoparametric hypersurfaces of OT-FKM type which hold up almost all of the isoparametric hypersurfaces with $g = 4$. For a symmetric Clifford system $\{P_0, \cdots, P_m\}$ on $\mathbb{R}^{2l}$, *i.e.* P_α's are symmetric matrices satisfying $P_\alpha P_\beta + P_\beta P_\alpha = 2\delta_{\alpha\beta} I_{2l}$, a homogeneous polynomial F of degree 4 on $\mathbb{R}^{2l}$ is defined as:

$$F(x) = |x|^4 - 2\sum_{\alpha=0}^{m} \langle P_\alpha x, x\rangle^2. \tag{1.8}$$

It is easy to verify that $f = F|_{S^{2l-1}(1)}$ is an isoparametric function on $S^{2l-1}(1)$, which is said to be of OT-FKM type following the names of Ozeki, Takeuchi, Ferus, Karcher and Münzner ([OT75, OT76, FKM81]). The focal submanifolds are $M_+ = f^{-1}(1)$, $M_- = f^{-1}(-1)$, and the multiplicity pair is $(m_1, m_2) = (m, l-m-1)$, provided $m > 0$ and $l - m - 1 > 0$, where $l = k\delta(m)$ $(k = 1, 2, 3, \cdots)$, $\delta(m)$ is the dimension of an irreducible module of the Clifford algebra $\mathcal{C}_{m-1}$. When $m \equiv 0(mod\ 4)$, according to [FKM81], there are two kinds of OT-FKM type isoparametric polynomials which are distinguished by Trace$(P_0P_1\cdots P_m)$, namely, the family with $P_0P_1\cdots P_m = \pm Id$, where without loss of generality we take the + sign, is called the *definite* family, and the others with $P_0P_1\cdots P_m \neq \pm Id$ are called *indefinite*. There are exactly $[\frac{k}{2}]$ non-congruent indefinite families.

The isoparametric hypersurfaces of OT-FKM type with multiplicities $(8, 7)$ have a wealth of geometric contents, being also the last case in the process of classification (cf. [Chi16]). During our investigation for the set C_A in Theorem 1.1, we find very intriguing relations between the focal submanifolds in the definite and indefinite families (now only one indefinite family). Denote by I the indefinite family, that is, $P =: P_0P_1\cdots P_8 \neq \pm Id$. It is easily seen that $\{\tilde{P}_0 =: P_0P, \cdots, \tilde{P}_8 =: P_8P\}$ constitutes a new symmetric Clifford system with $\tilde{P}_0\tilde{P}_1\cdots\tilde{P}_8 = Id$, which corresponds to the definite family, denoted by D. We add superscripts I and D to distinguish the corresponding focal submanifolds and the sets C_A. As a byproduct, we obtain

Proposition 1.2. *Let M_+, M_- be the focal submanifolds of isoparametric hypersurfaces of OT-FKM type with multiplicities $(8, 7)$ in $S^{n+1}(1)$. Then we can define isoparametric functions h on M_-^I and $\tilde{h}$ on M_-^D, whose isoparametric hypersurfaces $h^{-1}(0)$ and $\tilde{h}^{-1}(0)$:*

$$M_+^D \hookrightarrow M_-^I, \quad M_+^I \hookrightarrow M_-^D$$

are totally isoparametric, austere hypersurfaces. Moreover, the focal variety of h on M_-^I is exactly the set $C_A^I \subset M_-^I$.

We now need to explain the definitions appeared above. Recall that in a Riemannian manifold, isoparametric hypersurfaces defined by (1.1) are a family of parallel hypersurfaces with constant mean curvatures. Extending this concept, [GTY15] defined the object *k-isoparametric hypersurfaces*, whose nearby parallel hypersurfaces have constant i-th mean curvatures for $i = 1, \cdots, k$. In particular, *totally isoparametric hypersurfaces* are those whose nearby parallel hypersurfaces have constant principal curvatures. We would like to point out that in real space forms, an isoparametric hypersurface is totally isoparametric, while in other spaces it is usually not the case (cf. [GTY15]).

By definition, a submanifold with principal curvatures in any direction occurring in pairs of opposite signs is called an *austere submanifold* ([HL82]). Clearly, austere submanifolds are minimal submanifolds. It worths mentioning that [QT16] also constructed two sequences of totally isoparametric, austere hypersurfaces by using the Clifford algebra. However, our examples in Proposition 1.2 are different from theirs.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we prove the normal scalar curvature inequalities (1.5, 1.7) and characterize the equality conditions, i.e., the sets C_A, C_P and C_E, by using formulae (1.2, 1.3), the Simons identity ([Sim68]) and some identities in [OT75]. Section 3 is devoted to the classification of the set C_A where Condition A is satisfied. The algebra of Cayley numbers (Octonions), the Clifford algebra and the techniques in [FKM81] will play an important role in the proof. In Sections 4 and 5, we determine the sets C_P and C_E. There we will use the methods in [TY15], [QTY13] and [LZ16] where the parallelism and Einstein conditions were considered globally. At last, in Section 6, we prove Proposition 1.2, where the relations between the focal submanifolds with $g = 4$, $(8, 7)$ are shown and totally isoparametric functions are constructed.

2. Proof of the normal scalar curvature inequalities

In this section, we aim at giving a proof of the normal scalar curvature inequalities (1.5, 1.7) and their equality characterizations on focal submanifolds of isoparametric hypersurfaces with $g = 4$ in unit spheres.

Given a point of the focal submanifold $M_+^{m_1+2m_2}$ in the unit sphere $S^{2m_1+2m_2+1}(1)$, as we stated in the introduction, choosing a unit normal frame $\{n_0, n_1, \ldots, n_{m_1}\}$ of M_+, we can express the corresponding shape operators $\{S_0, S_1, \ldots, S_{m_1}\}$ to be the form of (1.2). Then a direct calculation leads to

$$[S_0, S_\alpha] = S_0S_\alpha - S_\alpha S_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2A_\alpha & B_\alpha \\ -2A_\alpha^t & 0 & -C_\alpha \\ -B_\alpha^t & C_\alpha^t & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad 1 \le \alpha \le m_1. \tag{2.1}$$

By the definition $\langle S_\alpha, S_\beta\rangle =: \mathrm{Trace}(S_\alpha S_\beta^t)$, (2.1) implies that

$$\|[S_0, S_\alpha]\|^2 = 8\|A_\alpha\|^2 + 2\|B_\alpha\|^2 + 2\|C_\alpha\|^2. \tag{2.2}$$

On the other hand, as we pointed out before, the shape operator of any unit normal vector has eigenvalues $+1$, -1 and 0 with multiplicities m_2, m_2 and m_1, respectively. It follows immediately that $\langle S_\alpha, S_\beta\rangle = 2m_2\delta_{\alpha\beta}$, in particular,

$$\|S_\alpha\|^2 = 2(\|A_\alpha\|^2 + \|B_\alpha\|^2 + \|C_\alpha\|^2) = 2m_2, \quad 1 \le \alpha \le m_1. \tag{2.3}$$

It follows from (2.2) and (2.3) that

$$2m_1m_2 \le \sum_{\alpha=1}^{m_1} \|[S_0, S_\alpha]\|^2 \le 8m_1m_2.$$

Here the first equality holds if and only if $A_\alpha = 0$, $\forall\ 1 \le \alpha \le m_1$, and the second holds if and only if $B_\alpha = C_\alpha = 0$, $\forall\ 1 \le \alpha \le m_1$. Given any $\beta = 0, \cdots, m_1$, we can diagonalize S_β as $diag(I_{m_2}, -I_{m_2}, 0_{m_1})$, while the other S_α's ($\alpha \ne \beta$) are in the block-form of (1.2). Thus the same argument as above shows

$$2m_1m_2 \le \sum_{\alpha=0}^{m_1} \|[S_\alpha, S_\beta]\|^2 \le 8m_1m_2,$$

which implies the inequality (1.5) immediately:

$$2m_1m_2(m_1+1) \le \rho^\perp =: \sum_{\alpha,\beta=0}^{m_1} \|[S_\alpha, S_\beta]\|^2 \le 8m_1m_2(m_1+1).$$

Clearly, at a point where the upper bound of $\rho^\perp$ is achieved, the Condition A must be satisfied. Conversely, it is not difficult to see that the upper bound of $\rho^\perp$ can be achieved at a point of Condition A.

We focus next on the first equality case in (1.5). The Simons identity for minimal submanifolds N in a unit sphere with codimension p is stated as (cf. [Sim68], [CdK70])

$$\frac{1}{2}\Delta\|S\|^2 = \|\overline{\nabla}S\|^2 + \dim N \cdot \|S\|^2 - \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{p} \langle S_\alpha, S_\beta\rangle^2 - \rho^\perp, \tag{2.4}$$

where we denote by S the second fundamental form and $\overline{\nabla}S$ its covariant derivative. Turning into our case, on the focal submanifold M_+, $\dim M_+ = m_1 + 2m_2$, $\|S\|^2 = 2m_2(m_1+1)$, the Simons identity (2.4) reduces to

$$\|\overline{\nabla}S\|^2 = \rho^\perp - 2m_1m_2(m_1+1).$$

Consequently, at a point in M_+, the first equality in (1.5) holds if and only if the second fundamental form is parallel. We denoted the set of these points by C_P in the introduction.

To derive the normal scalar curvature inequality (1.7), we firstly recall some useful formulae in Lemma 12 of [OT75]:

$$S_\alpha = S_\alpha^3, \quad S_\alpha = S_\beta^2 S_\alpha + S_\alpha S_\beta^2 + S_\beta S_\alpha S_\beta, \quad \alpha \neq \beta. \tag{2.5}$$

Using the formulae (2.3, 2.5), we are able to derive the new expression (1.6) for the normal scalar curvature:

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho^\perp &=: \sum_{\alpha,\beta=0}^{m_1} \|[S_\alpha, S_\beta]\|^2 = -\sum_{\alpha,\beta=0}^{m_1} \mathrm{Trace}(S_\alpha S_\beta - S_\beta S_\alpha)^2 \\
&= 2\sum_{\substack{\alpha,\beta=0,\\ \alpha\neq\beta}}^{m_1} \mathrm{Trace}(S_\alpha^2 S_\beta^2 - S_\alpha(S_\alpha - S_\beta^2 S_\alpha - S_\alpha S_\beta^2)) \\
&= 6\sum_{\alpha,\beta=0}^{m_1} \mathrm{Trace}(S_\alpha^2 S_\beta^2) - 6\sum_{\alpha=0}^{m_1} \mathrm{Trace}(S_\alpha^2) - 2m_1 \sum_{\alpha=0}^{m_1} \mathrm{Trace}(S_\alpha^2) \\
&= 6\|\sum_{\alpha=0}^{m_1} S_\alpha^2\|^2 - 4m_2(m_1+1)(m_1+3).
\end{aligned}$$

As we stated before, $\mathrm{Trace}\sum_{\alpha=0}^{m_1} S_\alpha^2 = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{m_1} \|S_\alpha\|^2 = 2m_2(m_1+1)$. By virtue of Schwartz inequality, we obtain $\|\mathrm{Trace}\sum_{\alpha=0}^{m_1} S_\alpha^2\|^2 \leq \|\sum_{\alpha=0}^{m_1} S_\alpha^2\|^2 \cdot \dim M_+$, alternatively speaking,

$$\|\sum_{\alpha=0}^{m_1} S_\alpha^2\|^2 \geq \frac{4m_2^2(m_1+1)^2}{m_1+2m_2}.$$

In this way, we get a new lower bound of $\rho^\perp$ as in the inequality (1.7):

$$\rho^\perp \geq 2m_1m_2(m_1+1) + \frac{6m_1m_2(m_1+1)}{2m_2+m_1}(2m_2 - m_1 - 2).$$

To see the equality case, taking advantage of the minimality of M_+ in $S^{n+1}(1)$ and using the Gauss equation, we can express the Ricci curvature of $X \in T_xM_+$ as:

$$Ric(X) = (\dim M_+ - 1)|X|^2 - \langle\sum_{\alpha=0}^{m_1} S_\alpha^2 X, X\rangle. \tag{2.6}$$

Therefore, the equality in Schwartz inequality holds, i.e., the equality in (1.7) holds if and only if the Ricci curvature is constant, i.e., the point belongs to the set C_E. Obviously, if $2m_2 - m_1 - 2 > 0$, the lower bound in (1.5) cannot be achieved, and the set C_P is empty on M_+.

3. The set C_A-Condition A

In this section we figure out the set C_A in Table 1 and Table 2 where Condition A is satisfied, or equivalently, the normal scalar curvature $\rho^\perp$ achieves its upper bound in (1.5) on the focal submanifolds $M_\pm$. The proof proceeds according to the important theorem of [DN83] mentioned in the introduction.

3.1. M_+ **with** $(3, 4k)$ **of OT-FKM type.**

Recall that the focal submanifold M_+ of OT-FKM type with multiplicities $(m, l-m-1)$ can be described as

$$M_+ = \{x \in S^{2l-1}(1) \mid \langle P_0 x, x\rangle = \cdots = \langle P_m x, x\rangle = 0\}. \tag{3.1}$$

Now let $m = 3$. As one knows, $\{P_0x, P_1x, P_2x, P_3x\}$ is an orthonormal basis of the normal space $T_x^\perp M_+$, and the corresponding shape operator is $S_\alpha X =: S_{P_\alpha x}X = -(P_\alpha X)^T$, $\alpha = 0, \cdots, 3$. More precisely,

$$-S_0X = P_0X - \langle P_0X, x\rangle x - \sum_{\alpha=0}^{3}\langle P_0X, P_\alpha x\rangle P_\alpha x = P_0X - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3}\langle X, P_0P_\alpha x\rangle P_\alpha x.$$

As a result,

$$S_0X = 0 \Leftrightarrow P_0X \in \mathrm{Span}\{P_1x, P_2x, P_3x\} \Leftrightarrow X \in \mathrm{Span}\{P_0P_1x, P_0P_2x, P_0P_3x\}.$$

Analogously, by the geometric meaning of Condition A, i.e., the kernels of all shape operators coincide, the arguments above imply that

$$\begin{aligned} x \in C_A \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad & x \in M_+, \text{and} \\ & \mathrm{Span}\{P_0P_1x, P_0P_2x, P_0P_3x\} = \mathrm{Span}\{P_1P_0x, P_1P_2x, P_1P_3x\} \\ & = \mathrm{Span}\{P_2P_0x, P_2P_1x, P_2P_3x\} = \mathrm{Span}\{P_3P_0x, P_3P_1x, P_3P_2x\}. \end{aligned}$$

Evidently, $\langle P_0P_2x, P_1P_0x\rangle = \langle P_0P_2x, P_1P_2x\rangle = 0$, and $\langle P_0P_3x, P_1P_0x\rangle = \langle P_0P_3x, P_1P_3x\rangle = 0$. Thus $\mathrm{Span}\{P_0P_1x, P_0P_2x, P_0P_3x\} = \mathrm{Span}\{P_1P_0x, P_1P_2x, P_1P_3x\}$ if and only if $P_0P_2x = \pm P_1P_3x$. Analogously, we obtain a further sufficient and necessary condition of $x \in C_A$ as

$$x \in M_+ \text{ and } P_0P_1P_2P_3x = \pm x.$$

Obviously, the condition $P_0P_1P_2P_3x = \pm x$ guarantees $x \in M_+$, thus $x \in C_A$ if and only if $x \in E_\pm(P_0P_1P_2P_3) \cap S^{8k+7}(1) = S^{4k+3}(1) \sqcup S^{4k+3}(1)$ (disjoint union of two connected components), since the matrix $P_0P_1P_2P_3$ is symmetric, orthogonal with trace zero: $\mathrm{Trace}(P_0P_1P_2P_3) = \mathrm{Trace}(P_1P_2P_3P_0) = -\mathrm{Trace}(P_0P_1P_2P_3)$. Here and throughout this paper, for a symmetric, orthogonal $2l \times 2l$ matrix Q with vanishing trace, we denote by $E_\pm(Q)$ the eigenspaces associated with eigenvalues ± 1, which have dimension $l = m_1 + m_2 + 1$, half the dimension of the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^{2l}$. Up to now, we have proved:

Proposition 3.1. *On M_+ with $(3, 4k)$ of OT-FKM type, $C_A = S^{4k+3}(1) \sqcup S^{4k+3}(1)$.*

3.2. M_+ with $(1,k)$, $(4,3)$ (OT-FKM type) and $(2,2)$.

At first, we recall a well-known fact that the isoparametric families with multiplicities $(2,2)$ and OT-FKM type $(1,k)$, $(4,3)$ (definite) are homogeneous. This explains the cases $C_A = M_\pm$ in Table 1 and 2 for $(1,k)$ and definite $(4,3)$ case, since the normal scalar curvature is constant in homogeneous cases.

To determine which one of, or whether both of the focal submanifolds satisfy Condition A in the $(2,2)$ case, we recall the normal scalar curvature inequalities (1.5, 1.7). Notice that now the two lower bounds in (1.5, 1.7) coincide with each other, i.e., the parallel condition (set C_P) coincides with the Einstein condition (set C_E). Notice also that the lower bound and the upper bound in (1.5) are different, thereby only one bound can be achieved on one single focal submanifold. Fortunately, it was proved in [QTY13] that the focal submanifold (say M_-) diffeomorphic to the oriented Grassmannian $\widetilde{G}_2(\mathbb{R}^5)$ is Einstein, while the other focal submanifold (say M_+) diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}P^3$ is not. Hence $C_P = C_E = M_-$ and $C_A = \emptyset$ on M_-. On the other hand, [OT76] and [DN83] asserted that there must be a point satisfying Condition A on focal submanifolds. Therefore, $C_A = M_+$ and $C_P = C_E = \emptyset$ on M_+.

Besides, as we mentioned in Remark 1.1, the indefinite $(4,3)$ family is congruent to the $(3,4)$ family in OT-FKM type. Thus the set C_A in M_- of indefinite $(4,3)$ family coincides with that in M_+ of $(3,4)$ family. Namely, $C_A = S^7(1) \sqcup S^7(1)$, which was proved in Subsection 3.1. We thus get the following

Proposition 3.2. *On the focal submanifolds with $(1,k)$, $(4,3)$ (OT-FKM type) and $(2,2)$, we have*

1. *On M_+ with $(1,k)$, $C_A = M_+$;*
2. *On M_- with $(4,3)$ of OT-FKM type , in the definite case, $C_A = M_-$, and in the indefinite case, $C_A = S^7(1) \sqcup S^7(1)$;*
3. *In the $(2,2)$ case, on the focal submanifold M_+ diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}P^3$, $C_A = M_+$ and $C_P = C_E = \emptyset$; while on the focal submanifold M_- diffeomorphic to the oriented Grassmannian $\widetilde{G}_2(\mathbb{R}^5)$, $C_P = C_E = M_-$ and $C_A = \emptyset$.*

3.3. M_+ with $(7,8k)$ of OT-FKM type.

Given a Clifford system $\{P_0, \cdots, P_7\}$ on R^{16k+16}, we define $P =: P_0 \cdots P_7$. It is straightforward to verify that P is symmetric with vanishing trace and $P^2 = Id$. We shall start by establishing an important assertion.

Assertion 3.3.1. *$Px = \pm x$ for $x \in C_A \subset M_+$.*

Proof. Using a similar argument as in Subsection 3.1, we find an equivalent condition of $x \in C_A$ as:

$$\text{Span}\{P_0 P_\alpha x, \alpha = 0, \cdots, 7, \alpha \neq 0\} = \text{Span}\{P_1 P_\alpha x, \alpha = 0, \cdots, 7, \alpha \neq 1\} \tag{3.2}$$

$$= \cdots = \mathrm{Span}\{P_7P_\alpha x, \alpha = 0, \cdots, 7, \alpha \neq 7\}.$$

With the known fact that $\langle x, P_\alpha P_\beta x\rangle = 0$ for any $\alpha, \beta = 0, \cdots, 7, \alpha \neq \beta$, we can interpret (3.2) in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{Span}\{P_0P_\alpha x, \alpha = 0, \cdots, 7\} = \mathrm{Span}\{P_1P_\alpha x, \alpha = 0, \cdots, 7\} \\ &= \cdots = \mathrm{Span}\{P_7P_\alpha x, \alpha = 0, \cdots, 7\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

In other words, if $x \in C_A$, then the space $\mathrm{Span}\{P_\alpha P_0 x, \cdots, P_\alpha P_7 x\}$ is independent of the choice of α. Thus we can define $V =: \mathrm{Span}\{P_\alpha P_0 x, \cdots, P_\alpha P_7 x\}$. Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} V = \mathrm{Span}\{P_\beta P_0 x, \cdots, P_\beta P_7 x\} &\xrightarrow{P_\beta} \mathrm{Span}\{P_0 x, \cdots, P_7 x\} \\ &\xrightarrow{P_\alpha} \mathrm{Span}\{P_\alpha P_0 x, \cdots, P_\alpha P_7 x\} = V, \end{aligned}$$

that is, $P_\alpha P_\beta : V \to V$, $\forall\ \alpha, \beta = 0, \cdots, 7$. Since $x \in V$, we get $Px = P_0 \cdots P_7 x \in V$. But we notice that for $\alpha \neq 0$, $\langle Px, P_0P_\alpha x\rangle = (-1)^{\alpha-1}\langle P_1 \cdots \widehat{P_\alpha} \cdots P_7 x, x\rangle = 0$, because $P_1 \cdots \widehat{P_\alpha} \cdots P_7$ is anti-symmetric. It leaves only that $Px = \pm x$, as desired. □

We remark that if $Px = \pm x$ for $x \in S^{16k+15}(1)$, then $\langle P_\alpha x, x\rangle = \pm\langle P_\alpha x, P_0 \cdots P_7 x\rangle = 0$ for any $\alpha = 0, \cdots, 7$, thus $x \in M_+$.

Next, let us represent $x \in S^{16k+15}(1)$ by $x = (u, v)$ with $|u|^2 + |v|^2 = 1$ and

$$u = (u_1, \cdots, u_{k+1}) \in \mathbb{O}^{k+1},\ v = (v_1, \cdots, v_{k+1}) \in \mathbb{O}^{k+1}.$$

We give now a specific expression of Clifford system on $\mathbb{R}^{16k+16} \cong \mathbb{O}^{2k+2}$, as there exists exactly one algebraic equivalence class of Clifford system when $m = 7 \not\equiv 0 (\mathrm{mod}\ 4)$:

$$P_0(u, v) = (u, -v), \quad P_\alpha(u, v) = (E_\alpha v, -E_\alpha u), \alpha = 1, \cdots, 7, \tag{3.4}$$

where E_α acts on u or v in this way:

$$E_\alpha u = (e_\alpha u_1, \cdots, e_\alpha u_{k+1}),\ \alpha = 1, \cdots, 7,$$

and $\{1, e_1, e_2, \cdots, e_7\}$ is the standard orthonormal basis of the octonions (Cayley numbers) $\mathbb{O}$.

Let $\mathrm{Im}\mathbb{O}$ be the set of pure imaginary Cayley numbers, and $wu =: (wu_1, \cdots, wu_{k+1})$. Noticing that $P_0P_\alpha x = (E_\alpha v, E_\alpha u)$ $(\alpha \neq 0)$, we can illustrate (3.2) in a simpler way as

Assertion 3.3.2. *$x \in C_A$ if and only if $x \in M_+$ and $P_\alpha P_\beta x \in \{(wv, wu) \mid w \in \mathrm{Im}\mathbb{O}\}$, for $\alpha, \beta = 1, ..., 7, \alpha \neq \beta$.*

Assertion 3.3.3. *$P(u, v) = (v, u)$, for $u, v \in \mathbb{O}^{k+1}$.*

Proof. Let $1 = (1,0), e_1 = (i,0), e_2 = (j,0), e_3 = (k,0), e_4 = (0,1), e_5 = (0,i), e_6 = (0,j), e_7 = (0,k) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$. Recalling the Cayley-Dickson construction of the product of Octonions $\mathbb{O} \cong \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{O} \times \mathbb{O} & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{O} \\ (a,b),\ (c,d) & \mapsto & (a,b)\cdot(c,d) =: (ac - \bar{d}b,\ da + b\bar{c}), \end{array}$$

one can see easily that $e_1(e_2(\cdots(e_7 x))) = -x$, $\forall\ x \in \mathbb{O}$. Then the conclusion follows immediately from $P_0 \cdots P_7(u,v) = (-E_1(\cdots(E_7 v)), -E_1(\cdots(E_7 u)))$. □

For $x \in C_A$, we can conclude from Assertions 3.3.1 and 3.3.3 that $u = \pm v$. Let us focus on the case $u = v$, i.e., $x = (u,u) \in S^{16k+15}(1)$. The argument in the case $u = -v$ is analogous. Then Assertion 3.3.2 becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & x = (u,u) \in C_A \\ \Leftrightarrow\ & P_\alpha P_\beta x = (-E_\alpha(E_\beta u), -E_\alpha(E_\beta u)) \in \{(w'u, w'u) \mid w' \in \mathrm{Im}\mathbb{O}\}, \forall\ \alpha \neq \beta \geq 1, \\ \Leftrightarrow\ & E_\alpha(E_\beta u) = (e_\alpha(e_\beta u_1), \cdots, e_\alpha(e_\beta u_{k+1})) = (wu_1, \cdots, wu_{k+1}) \text{ for some } w \in \mathrm{Im}\mathbb{O}, \\ & \forall\ \alpha \neq \beta \geq 1, \\ \Leftrightarrow\ & \frac{1}{|u_i|^2}(e_\alpha(e_\beta u_i))\bar{u_i} = \frac{1}{|u_j|^2}(e_\alpha(e_\beta u_j))\bar{u_j} = w \in \mathrm{Im}\mathbb{O}\ \textit{for}\ u_i, u_j \neq 0, i, j = 1, \cdots, k+1, \\ & \text{for some } w \in \mathrm{Im}\mathbb{O}, \forall\ \alpha \neq \beta \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

As a matter of fact, we notice that Re $(e_\alpha(e_\beta u_i))\bar{u_i} = \langle e_\alpha(e_\beta u_i), u_i\rangle = \langle e_\beta u_i, \bar{e}_\alpha u_i\rangle = \langle e_\beta, -e_\alpha\rangle |u_i|^2 = 0$, i.e., $(e_\alpha(e_\beta u_i))\bar{u_i} \in \mathrm{Im}\mathbb{O}$, for $\alpha \neq \beta \geq 1$. To continue the investigation, we need

Definition 3.1. *For two unit Cayley numbers σ, τ, the pair $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ satisfies Condition X, if $(e_\alpha(e_\beta\sigma))\bar{\sigma} = (e_\alpha(e_\beta\tau))\bar{\tau}$, for any $\alpha, \beta = 1, \cdots, 7, \alpha \neq \beta$.*

Clearly, another saying of Condition X is that $(x(y\sigma))\bar{\sigma} = (x(y\tau))\bar{\tau}$, $\forall\ x, y \in \mathbb{O}$.

Definition 3.2. *For two unit Cayley numbers σ, τ, the pair $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ satisfies Condition Y, if $(x\sigma)\tau = x(\sigma\tau)$, for any $x \in \mathbb{O}$.*

Now we would like to list three observations:

Taking $y = \bar{\sigma}$ in the definition of Condition X, we obtain easily the following:

Observation 3.3.1. *For $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{O}$ with $|\sigma| = |\tau| = 1$, suppose $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ satisfies Condition X. Then $\{\bar{\sigma}, \tau\}$ satisfies Condition Y.*

Writing $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$, $\tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$, we obtain

Observation 3.3.2. *For $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{O}$ with $|\sigma| = |\tau| = 1$, suppose $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ satisfies Condition X. Then $|\sigma_1| = |\tau_1|$, $|\sigma_2| = |\tau_2|$.*

Proof. Take $x = (i, 0)$, $y = (j, 0)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}(x(y\sigma))\bar{\sigma} &= (ij\sigma_1, \sigma_2 ji)\bar{\sigma} = (k\sigma_1, -\sigma_2 k)(\bar{\sigma}_1, -\sigma_2) = ((|\sigma_1|^2 - |\sigma_2|^2)k, -2\sigma_2 k\sigma_1),\\ (x(y\tau))\bar{\tau} &= (ij\tau_1, \tau_2 ji)\bar{\tau} = (k\tau_1, -\tau_2 k)(\bar{\tau}_1, -\tau_2) = ((|\tau_1|^2 - |\tau_2|^2)k, -2\tau_2 k\tau_1).\end{aligned}$$

By the assumption that $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ satisfies Condition X, we derive from the first components of $(x(y\sigma))\bar{\sigma}$ and $(x(y\tau))\bar{\tau}$ that $|\sigma_1|^2 - |\sigma_2|^2 = |\tau_1|^2 - |\tau_2|^2$. Combining with $|\sigma| = |\tau| = 1$, it follows easily that $|\sigma_1| = |\tau_1|$, $|\sigma_2| = |\tau_2|$. □

Observation 3.3.3. *For unit $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in \mathbb{O}$ with $\sigma_2 \neq 0$, and unit $\tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathbb{O}$, the pair $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ satisfies Condition Y if and only if* $\mathrm{Im}\ \sigma \mathbin{/\!\!/} \mathrm{Im}\ \tau$, *where* $\mathrm{Im}\ \sigma$ *and* $\mathrm{Im}\ \tau$ *stand for the imaginary parts of σ and τ, respectively.*

Proof. Take an arbitrary Cayley number $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$. We calculate

$$\begin{aligned}(x\sigma)\tau &= (x_1\sigma_1 - \bar{\sigma}_2 x_2, \sigma_2 x_1 + x_2\bar{\sigma}_1)(\tau_1, \tau_2)\\ &= ((x_1\sigma_1 - \bar{\sigma}_2 x_2)\tau_1 - \bar{\tau}_2(\sigma_2 x_1 + x_2\bar{\sigma}_1), \tau_2(x_1\sigma_1 - \bar{\sigma}_2 x_2) + (\sigma_2 x_1 + x_2\bar{\sigma_1})\bar{\tau}_1)\\ x(\sigma\tau) &= (x_1, x_2)(\sigma_1\tau_1 - \bar{\tau}_2\sigma_2, \tau_2\sigma_1 + \sigma_2\bar{\tau}_1)\\ &= (x_1(\sigma_1\tau_1 - \bar{\tau}_2\sigma_2) - \overline{\tau_2\sigma_1 + \sigma_2\bar{\tau}_1}x_2, (\tau_2\sigma_1 + \sigma_2\bar{\tau}_1)x_1 + x_2\overline{\sigma_1\tau_1 - \bar{\tau}_2\sigma_2}).\end{aligned}$$

Then the pair $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ satisfies Condition Y, i.e., $(x\sigma)\tau = x(\sigma\tau)$, for arbitrary $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$, if and only if

$$\bar{\tau}_2\sigma_2 x_1 = x_1\bar{\tau}_2\sigma_2, \quad \forall x_1 \in \mathbb{H}, \tag{3.5}$$

$$\bar{\sigma}_2 x_2\tau_1 + \bar{\tau}_2 x_2\bar{\sigma}_1 = \bar{\sigma}_1\bar{\tau}_2 x_2 + \tau_1\bar{\sigma}_2 x_2, \quad \forall x_2 \in \mathbb{H}, \tag{3.6}$$

$$\tau_2 x_1\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 x_1\bar{\tau}_1 = \tau_2\sigma_1 x_1 + \sigma_2\bar{\tau}_1 x_1, \quad \forall x_1 \in \mathbb{H}, \tag{3.7}$$

$$x_2\bar{\sigma}_1\bar{\tau}_1 - \tau_2\bar{\sigma}_2 x_2 = x_2\bar{\tau}_1\bar{\sigma}_1 - x_2\bar{\sigma}_2\tau_2, \quad \forall x_2 \in \mathbb{H}, \tag{3.8}$$

Recall the fact that the quaternionic number which commutes with any quaternionic numbers must be a real number. Thus

$$(3.5) \Leftrightarrow \tau_2 = \lambda\sigma_2, \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Substituting $\tau_2 = \lambda\sigma_2$ into (3.6), we get $(\bar{\sigma}_2 x_2)(\tau_1 + \lambda\bar{\sigma}_1) = (\tau_1 + \lambda\bar{\sigma}_1)(\bar{\sigma}_2 x_2)$, $\forall\ x_2 \in \mathbb{H}$. Notice that $\bar{\sigma}_2 x_2$ achieves all the quaternionic numbers, since $\sigma_2 \neq 0$. Thus

$$(3.5), (3.6) \Leftrightarrow \tau_2 = \lambda\sigma_2, \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ and } \mu =: \tau_1 + \lambda\bar{\sigma}_1 \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Therefore, if (3.5), (3.6) hold, then (3.7) and (3.8) are satisfied automatically. Summarizing above, we have arrived at the conclusion as desired:

$$\begin{aligned}&\{\sigma, \tau\} \text{ with } \sigma_2 \neq 0 \text{ satisfies Condition Y}\\ \Leftrightarrow\ &(\tau_1, \tau_2) = (\mu - \lambda\bar{\sigma}_1, \lambda\sigma_2), \text{ for some } \lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R}\\ \Leftrightarrow\ &\mathrm{Im}\sigma \mathbin{/\!\!/} \mathrm{Im}\tau.\end{aligned}$$

□

With all these preparations, we are in a position to characterize those points satisfying Condition X.

Lemma 3.1. *For unit Cayley numbers $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{O}$, the pair $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ satisfies Condition X, if and only if $\sigma = \pm\tau$.*

Proof. Clearly, the pair $\{\sigma, \tau\} = \{\sigma, \pm\sigma\}$ satisfies Condition X. So we need only to prove the opposite side.

Suppose $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ satisfies Condition X. Expressing $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{O}$ as $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2), \tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$, we divide the proof into two cases:

Case 1: $\sigma_2 = 0$. By Observation 3.3.2, we have $|\tau_1| = |\sigma_1|$, $|\tau_2| = |\sigma_2| = 0$, thus $\tau_2 = 0$. For any $x = (x_1, x_2), y = (y_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{H} \times \mathbb{H}$,

$$\begin{aligned}(x(y\sigma))\bar{\sigma} &= (x_1y_1|\sigma_1|^2 - \sigma_1\bar{y}_1x_2\bar{\sigma}_1,\ y_1\bar{\sigma}_1x_1\sigma_1 + x_2\bar{\sigma}_1\bar{y}_1\sigma_1),\\ (x(y\tau))\bar{\tau} &= (x_1y_1|\tau_1|^2 - \tau_1\bar{y}_1x_2\bar{\tau}_1,\ y_1\bar{\tau}_1x_1\tau_1 + x_2\bar{\tau}_1\bar{y}_1\tau_1).\end{aligned}$$

Thus $(x(y\sigma))\bar{\sigma} = (x(y\tau))\bar{\tau}$, $\forall\ x, y \in \mathbb{O}$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned}&\sigma_1\bar{y}_1x_2\bar{\sigma}_1 = \tau_1\bar{y}_1x_2\bar{\tau}_1,\\ &\bar{\sigma}_1x_1\sigma_1 = \bar{\tau}_1x_1\tau_1,\ \bar{\sigma}_1\bar{y}_1\sigma_1 = \bar{\tau}_1\bar{y}_1\tau_1, \forall\ x_1, x_2, y_1 \in \mathbb{H}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

From the arbitrary choices of x_1, x_2 and y_1, it follows that (3.9) is equivalent to $\sigma_1z\bar{\sigma}_1 = \tau_1z\bar{\tau}_1$ and $\bar{\sigma}_1z'\sigma_1 = \bar{\tau}_1z'\tau_1$, for any $z, z' \in \mathbb{H}$, that is, $\bar{\sigma}_1\tau_1 \in \mathbb{R}$. Alternatively speaking, $\tau_1 = \pm\sigma_1$, thus $\tau = \pm\sigma$.

Case 2: $\sigma_2 \neq 0$. From Observations 3.3.1 and 3.3.3, it follows that $\mathrm{Im}\bar{\sigma} /\!\!/ \mathrm{Im}\tau$. Then combining with Observation 3.3.2, we obtain that

$$(\sigma, \tau) = (\sigma, \pm\sigma)\ \textit{or}\ (\sigma, \pm\bar{\sigma}).$$

Obviously, the pair $\{\sigma, \pm\sigma\}$ satisfies Condition X, so we are left to consider the case $\tau = \pm\bar{\sigma}$. If $\mathrm{Re}\ \sigma = 0$, we have $\bar{\sigma} = -\sigma$, thus the pair $\{\sigma, \tau\} = \{\sigma, \pm\bar{\sigma}\} = \{\sigma, \mp\sigma\}$ satisfies Condition X. If $\mathrm{Re}\ \sigma \neq 0$, we have $\sigma + \bar{\sigma} = 2\mathrm{Re}\sigma =: \lambda \neq 0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Here we take $\tau = \bar{\sigma}$, since the proof for $\tau = -\bar{\sigma}$ is analogous. A direct calculation leads to

$$\begin{aligned}(x(y\bar{\sigma}))\sigma &= (x(y(\lambda - \sigma)))(\lambda - \bar{\sigma}) = (\lambda xy - x(y\sigma))(\lambda - \bar{\sigma})\\ &= \lambda^2xy - \lambda(xy)\bar{\sigma} - \lambda x(y\sigma) + (x(y\sigma))\bar{\sigma},\ \text{for } x, y \in \mathbb{O}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus the pair $\{\sigma, \tau\} = \{\sigma, \bar{\sigma}\}$ satisfies Condition X, if and only if

$$\lambda xy - (xy)\bar{\sigma} - x(y\sigma) = 0,\ \forall\ x, y \in \mathbb{O},$$

which is equivalent to

$$\lambda xy + x(y\bar{\sigma}) = (xy)\bar{\sigma} + x(y(\sigma + \bar{\sigma})) = (xy)\bar{\sigma} + \lambda xy,\ \forall\ x, y \in \mathbb{O}.$$

Namely,

$$x(y\bar{\sigma}) = (xy)\bar{\sigma},\ \forall\ x, y \in \mathbb{O}.$$

However, for $\sigma_2 \neq 0$, there do exist $x, y \in \mathbb{O}$ such that $x(y\bar{\sigma}) \neq (xy)\bar{\sigma}$. For example, let $x = (i, 0)$ and $y = (j, 0)$. Then $x(y\bar{\sigma}) = (k\bar{\sigma}_1, \sigma_2 k)$, while $(xy)\bar{\sigma} = (k\bar{\sigma}_1, -\sigma_2 k)$. Therefore, the pair $\{\sigma, \tau\} = \{\sigma, \bar{\sigma}\}$ does not satisfy Condition X.

Summarizing all the results above, if the pair $\{\sigma, \tau\}$ satisfies Condition X, we can obtain $\tau = \pm\sigma$, as desired. □

Recall that by Assertions 3.3.1 and 3.3.2, $x = (u, v) \in C_A$ if and only if $u = \pm v$, and for any two non-vanishing components u_i, u_j of u, the pair $\{\frac{u_i}{|u_i|}, \frac{u_j}{|u_j|}\}$ satisfies Condition X. Thus Lemma 3.1 yields that $\frac{u_i}{|u_i|} = \pm\frac{u_j}{|u_j|}$, which leads to the following corollary:

Corollary 3.1. *On the focal submanifold M_+ of OT-FKM type with $(7, 8k)$, $x = (u, v) \in C_A$ if and only if there exist $\sigma \in \mathbb{O}$ with $|\sigma| = 1$, and $\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \lambda_i^2 = 1$, such that $u = \pm v = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\lambda_1\sigma, \cdots, \lambda_{k+1}\sigma)$.*

Proposition 3.3. *C_A of the focal submanifold M_+ of OT-FKM type with $(7, 8k)$ is isometric to*

$$(S^k(1) \times S^7(1))/\mathbb{Z}_2 \sqcup (S^k(1) \times S^7(1))/\mathbb{Z}_2,$$

where we identify $((\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_{k+1}), \sigma)$ with $((-\lambda_1, \cdots, -\lambda_{k+1}), -\sigma)$ in $S^k(1) \times S^7(1)$.

Proof. We denote C_A by $C_A = C_A^+ \sqcup C_A^-$, where C_A^+ is the component with $x = (u, u)$ and C_A^- is the component with $x = (u, -u)$. As in [TY13], we define a map

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi : S^k(1) \times S^7(1) &\to C_A^+ \subset \mathbb{R}^{16k+16} \\ (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_{k+1}), \sigma &\mapsto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\lambda_1\sigma, \cdots, \lambda_{k+1}\sigma, \lambda_1\sigma, \cdots, \lambda_{k+1}\sigma) \end{aligned}$$

It satisfies $\Psi((\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_{k+1}), \sigma) = \Psi((-\lambda_1, \cdots, -\lambda_{k+1}), -\sigma)$. The verification that Ψ is an isometry is straightforward. □

Remark 3.1. *Let η be the Hopf line bundle over the real projective space $\mathbb{R}P^7$. As is well known, the Grothendieck ring $\widetilde{KO}(\mathbb{R}P^7)$ is cyclic of order 8 with generator $\eta - \mathbf{1}$ (*[Hus75]*). Observe that $(S^k \times S^7)/\mathbb{Z}_2$ (compare with* [TXY12]*) is diffeomorphic to the total space of the sphere bundle of $(k+1)\eta$. Hence $(S^k \times S^7)/\mathbb{Z}_2$ is diffeomorphic to $S^k \times \mathbb{R}P^7$ provided that 8 divides $k+1$.*

3.4. M_- with $(8, 7)$ of OT-FKM type.

In this subsection, we want to describe the set C_A in M_- of OT-FKM type with $(8, 7)$.

By the definition of the isoparametric polynomial (1.8), following [FKM81], one has

$$M_- \;=\; F^{-1}(-1) \cap S^{31}(1) = \{x \in S^{31}(1) \mid \sum_{\alpha=0}^{8} \langle P_\alpha x, x\rangle^2 = 1\}$$

$$= \quad \{x \in S^{31}(1) \mid \text{there exists } Q_0 \in \Sigma(P_0, \cdots, P_8) \text{ with } Q_0 x = x\},$$

where $\Sigma(P_0, \cdots, P_8)$ is the unit sphere in $\mathrm{Span}\{P_0, \cdots, P_8\}$, which is called the Clifford sphere. Now given $x \in M_-$ and $Q_0 \in \Sigma(P_0, \cdots, P_8)$ with $Q_0 x = x$, we define

$$\Sigma_{Q_0} =: \{Q \in \Sigma(P_0, \cdots, P_8) | \ \langle Q_0, Q\rangle =: \frac{1}{2l}\mathrm{Trace}(Q_0 Q) = 0\},$$

which is the equatorial sphere of $\Sigma(P_0, \cdots, P_8)$ orthogonal to Q_0. Then we can extend Q_0 to such a symmetric Clifford system $\{Q_0, Q_1, \cdots, Q_8\}$ with $Q_i \in \Sigma_{Q_0}$ $(i \geq 1)$ that $\Sigma(Q_0, Q_1, \cdots, Q_8) = \Sigma(P_0, P_1, \cdots, P_8)$.

Let's now choose $N_1, N_2, \cdots, N_8$ as an orthonormal basis of $T_x^\perp M_-$ in $S^{31}(1)$. According to **4.5**(iii) of [FKM81],

$$\begin{aligned} T_x^\perp M_- &= \{N \in E_-(Q_0) \mid N \perp \Sigma_{Q_0} x\}, \\ ker S_N &= \{v \in E_+(Q_0) \mid v \perp x, \ v \perp \Sigma_{Q_0} N\}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

for any unit normal vector N. Besides, Lemma 2.1 in [TY15] provides an orthonormal basis of $T_x M_-$: for a given $1 \leq i \leq 8$,

$$\{Q_1 x, \cdots, Q_8 x, \ Q_i N_1, \cdots, Q_i N_8, \ Q_i Q_1 x, \cdots, \widehat{Q_i Q_i x}, \cdots, Q_i Q_8 x\}. \tag{3.11}$$

Let's arrange these basis vectors in an alternate order as eigenvectors of Q_0:

$$\begin{aligned} E_-(Q_0) &= \mathrm{Span}\{N_1, \cdots, N_8, \ Q_1 x, \cdots, Q_8 x\} \\ E_+(Q_0) &= \mathrm{Span}\{Q_i N_1, \cdots, Q_i N_8, \ Q_i Q_1 x, \cdots, Q_i Q_8 x\} \text{ for a given } 1 \leq i \leq 8. \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

By the definition of C_A and (3.10), we find that $x \in C_A$ if and only if $\mathrm{Span}\{Q_1 N, \cdots, Q_8 N\} \subset E_+(Q_0)$ is independent of the choice of N. Equivalently, for $x \in M_-$,

$$x \in C_A \Leftrightarrow \mathrm{Span}\{Q_i N_1, \cdots, Q_i N_8, \ i = 1, \cdots, 8\} \text{ is of dimensional } 8. \tag{3.13}$$

In addition, we observe that

$$\dim \mathrm{Span}\{Q_1 N_k, \cdots, Q_8 N_k\} = \dim \mathrm{Span}\{Q_i N_1, \cdots, Q_i N_8\}, \text{ for } \ 1 \leq i, k \leq 8.$$

This leads to alternative equivalent conditions of Condition A:

$$x \in C_A \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathrm{Span}\{Q_i N_1, \cdots, Q_i N_8\} \text{ is fixed for any } 1 \leq i \leq 8, \tag{3.14}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \quad \mathrm{Span}\{Q_i Q_1 x, \cdots, Q_i Q_8 x\} \text{ is fixed for any } 1 \leq i \leq 8. \tag{3.15}$$

Observe that

$$\mathrm{Span}\{Q_j N_1, \cdots, Q_j N_8\} \xrightarrow{Q_j} \mathrm{Span}\{N_1, \cdots, N_8\} \xrightarrow{Q_i} \mathrm{Span}\{Q_i N_1, \cdots, Q_i N_8\}.$$

Thus for $x \in C_A \subset M_-$, $i, j, k = 1, \cdots, 8, i \neq j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q_i Q_j : \quad & \mathrm{Span}\{Q_k N_1, \cdots, Q_k N_8\} = \mathrm{Span}\{Q_j N_1, \cdots, Q_j N_8\} \\ & \to \mathrm{Span}\{Q_i N_1, \cdots, Q_i N_8\} = \mathrm{Span}\{Q_k N_1, \cdots, Q_k N_8\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Then from (3.12), (3.15) and the fact that Q_i maps $E_\pm(Q_0)$ to $E_\mp(Q_0)$, it follows that (3.16) is equivalent to either of the following

$$Q_iQ_j : \mathrm{Span}\{Q_kQ_1x, \cdots, Q_kQ_8x\} \to \mathrm{Span}\{Q_kQ_1x, \cdots, Q_kQ_8x\}, \tag{3.17}$$

$$Q_iQ_j : \mathrm{Span}\{Q_1x, \cdots, Q_8x\} \to \mathrm{Span}\{Q_1x, \cdots, Q_8x\}. \tag{3.18}$$

Conversely, it is evident that each of (3.16-3.18) implies (3.13-3.15) and hence, all of them are equivalent conditions for $x \in C_A$.

Now we are ready to determine the set $C_A \subset M_-$ for the case with $(8, 7)$. As in the introduction, we still add superscripts I and D to distinguish the corresponding focal submanifolds and the sets C_A in the indefinite and definite cases, respectively. That is, the indefinite type Clifford system $\{P_0, \cdots, P_8\}$ for I and the definite $\{\tilde{P}_0 =: P_0P, \cdots, \tilde{P}_8 =: P_8P\}$ for D. From now on, we denote $P =: P_0 \cdots P_8 \neq \pm Id$. Firstly, we give the following

Proposition 3.4. $C_A^I = M_-^I \cap M_-^D = (E_+(P) \cup E_-(P)) \cap S^{31}(1) = S^{15}(1) \sqcup S^{15}(1)$.

Proof. We shall start by verifying

$$M_-^I \cap M_-^D = E_\pm(P) \cap S^{31}(1). \tag{3.19}$$

If $x \in M_-^I$, then there exists $Q_0 \in \Sigma(P_0, \cdots, P_8)$ such that $Q_0x = x$. In addition, if $x \in M_-^D$, that is, $1 = \sum_{\alpha=0}^8 \langle \tilde{P}_\alpha x, x\rangle^2 = \sum_{\alpha=0}^8 \langle P_\alpha Px, x\rangle^2$, which implies that $Px \in \mathrm{Span}\{P_0x, \cdots, P_8x\} = \mathrm{Span}\{Q_0x, \cdots, Q_8x\}$ by the aforementioned statement $\Sigma(Q_0, Q_1, \cdots, Q_8) = \Sigma(P_0, P_1, \cdots, P_8)$. So we can express $Px = \sum_{\alpha=0}^8 c_\alpha Q_\alpha x$ $(c_\alpha \in \mathbb{R})$ in the following way:

$$Px = PQ_0x = Q_0Px = c_0x + \sum_{\alpha=1}^8 c_\alpha Q_0Q_\alpha x = c_0x - \sum_{\alpha=1}^8 c_\alpha Q_\alpha x.$$

The arguments above imply that $Px = c_0x$ and thus $Px = \pm x$ since $|Px| = |x| = 1$. Therefore, $M_-^I \cap M_-^D \subset E_\pm(P) \cap S^{31}(1)$.

Conversely, suppose $x \in E_+(P) \cap S^{31}(1)$ (the proof for $x \in E_-(P) \cap S^{31}(1)$ will follow the same way). We know that $P_\alpha^2 = P^2 = Id$, $\mathrm{Trace}P_\alpha = \mathrm{Trace}P = 0$, which lead us to the decomposition $\mathbb{R}^{32} = E_+(P_0) \oplus E_-(P_0) = E_+(P) \oplus E_-(P)$. Thus we can decompose x as

$$x = x_+ + x_- \in (E_+(P) \cap E_+(P_0)) \oplus (E_+(P) \cap E_-(P_0)).$$

If $x_+ = 0$ or $x_- = 0$, it follows easily that $\langle P_0x, x\rangle^2 = \langle P_0Px, x\rangle^2 = 1$, which implies $x \in M_-^I \cap M_-^D$. So we are left to consider $x_+ \neq 0$ and $x_- \neq 0$. Noticing that

$$P_\alpha : E_\pm(P_0) \to E_\mp(P_0),\ \alpha = 1, \cdots, 8,$$

we obtain $\dim E_+(P)\cap E_+(P_0) = \dim E_+(P)\cap E_-(P_0) = 8$, and further, $E_+(P)\cap E_-(P_0) = \mathrm{Span}\{P_1x_+,\cdots,P_8x_+\}$ for dimensional reason. Thus we can express x_- as

$$x_- = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{8}\langle x_-, P_\alpha\frac{x_+}{|x_+|}\rangle P_\alpha\frac{x_+}{|x_+|} = \frac{1}{|x_+|^2}\sum_{\alpha=1}^{8}\langle x_-, P_\alpha x_+\rangle P_\alpha x_+,$$

which implies that $|x_+|^2|x_-|^2 = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{8}\langle x_-, P_\alpha x_+\rangle^2$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\alpha=0}^{8}\langle P_\alpha x, x\rangle^2 &= (|x_+|^2-|x_-|^2)^2 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{8}\langle P_\alpha(x_+ + x_-),(x_+ + x_-)\rangle^2\\ &= (|x_+|^2+|x_-|^2)^2 - 4|x_+|^2|x_-|^2 + 4\sum_{\alpha=1}^{8}\langle x_-, P_\alpha x_+\rangle^2\\ &= |x|^4 = 1,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\sum_{\alpha=0}^{8}\langle \tilde{P}_\alpha x, x\rangle^2 = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{8}\langle P_\alpha x, Px\rangle^2 = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{8}\langle P_\alpha x, x\rangle^2 = 1,$$

that is, $x\in M_-^I\cap M_-^D$.

In conclusion, $M_-^I\cap M_-^D = E_\pm(P)\cap S^{31}(1)$, proving the assertion (3.19).

Next, we will prove

$$C_A^I = E_\pm(P)\cap S^{31}(1). \tag{3.20}$$

Suppose $x\in C_A^I\subset M_-^I$. Then there exists $Q_0\in\Sigma(P_0,\cdots,P_8)$ such that $Q_0x = x$. We extend Q_0 to a symmetric Clifford system $\{Q_0,\cdots,Q_8\}$ in such a way that $P = P_0\cdots P_8 = Q_0\cdots Q_8$, which makes $Px = Q_1\cdots Q_8x$. Since $x\in C_A^I$, we have (3.17):

$$Q_iQ_j : \mathrm{Span}\{Q_kQ_1x,\cdots,Q_kQ_8x\}\to\mathrm{Span}\{Q_kQ_1x,\cdots,Q_kQ_8x\},\quad 1\le i,j,k\le 8, i\ne j.$$

Cycling down, we get $Px = (Q_1\cdots Q_6)(Q_7Q_8x)\in\mathrm{Span}\{Q_kQ_1x,\cdots,Q_kQ_8x\}$. Then from the observation that $\langle Px, Q_kQ_ix\rangle = \langle Q_1\cdots Q_8x, Q_kQ_ix\rangle = 0$, $\forall\ i\ne k$, we derive $Px = Q_1\cdots Q_8x = \pm x$. Namely, $x\in E_\pm(P)\cap S^{31}(1)$.

Conversely, suppose $x\in E_\pm(P)\cap S^{31}(1)$. From (3.19), it follows that $x\in M_-^I\cap M_-^D\subset M_-^I$. Then there exist $Q_0\in\Sigma(P_0,\cdots,P_8)$ such that $Q_0x = x$, which leads to $Q_1\cdots Q_8x = Px = \pm x$. In other words, $x\in E_+(Q_0)\cap E_\pm(Q_1\cdots Q_8)$. Then following the arguments on p.498-499 of [FKM81], we obtain

$$ker S_N = \{\omega\in E_+(Q_0)\cap E_\pm(Q_1\cdots Q_8)\mid\langle\omega,x\rangle = 0\},$$

which is a fixed set independent of the choice of the unit normal vector N. Alternatively speaking, $E_\pm(P)\cap S^{31}(1)\subset C_A^I$. The proof of (3.20) and thus the proof of Proposition 3.4 is now complete. □

As the last content of this subsection, we will concentrate on the definite case. As in Section 6.6 of [FKM81], we can extend a Clifford system $\{P_0, \cdots, P_8\}$ on $\mathbb{R}^{32}$ to a system $\{P_0, \cdots, P_9\}$. Recall $P =: P_0 \cdots P_8$. With this preparation, we are ready to show the following criterion for C_A^D:

Proposition 3.5. $x \in C_A^D \Leftrightarrow \langle x, Px\rangle^2 + \langle x, P_9 x\rangle^2 = 1$, $x \in S^{31}(1)$.

Proof. Firstly, we assume the left. Following the aforementioned illustration of the definite case, if $x \in C_A^D \subset M_-^D$, there exists $Q_0 \in \Sigma(P_0, \cdots, P_8)$ such that $Q_0 P x = x$. As before, we extend Q_0 to a symmetric Clifford system $\{Q_0, \cdots, Q_8\}$ in such a way that $P = P_0 \cdots P_8 = Q_0 \cdots Q_8$. Noticing that $Q_1 Q_0 = -Q_0 Q_1$, $P_9 Q_0 = -Q_0 P_9$ and $P_9 P = -P P_9$, we can decompose $\mathbb{R}^{32}$ as the direct sum of four 8-dimensional subspaces

$$\mathbb{R}^{32} = (E_+(Q_0) \cap E_+(P)) \oplus (E_+(Q_0) \cap E_-(P)) \oplus (E_-(Q_0) \cap E_+(P)) \oplus (E_-(Q_0) \cap E_-(P)),$$

and express $x = x_{++} + x_{+-} + x_{-+} + x_{--}$ with corresponding indexes. Thus $Q_0 P x = x$ suggests that $x_{+-} = x_{-+} = 0$, which leaves

$$x = x_{++} + x_{--} \in (E_+(Q_0) \cap E_+(P)) \oplus (E_-(Q_0) \cap E_-(P)).$$

Clearly, if $x_{++} = 0$ or $x_{--} = 0$, then $\langle x, Px\rangle^2 = 1$, and $\langle x, P_9 x\rangle^2 = \langle Px, P_9 x\rangle^2 = 0$. Hence the equation $\langle x, Px\rangle^2 + \langle x, P_9 x\rangle^2 = 1$ holds. So we only need to consider the case that $x_{++} \neq 0$ and $x_{--} \neq 0$.

An observation shows

$$\begin{aligned} E_+(Q_0) \cap E_+(P) &= \mathrm{Span}\{Q_i Q_j x_{++} \ : \ 1 \leq i, j \leq 8\} \cong \mathbb{R}^8, \\ E_-(Q_0) \cap E_-(P) &= \mathrm{Span}\{Q_i Q_j x_{--} \ : \ 1 \leq i, j \leq 8\} \cong \mathbb{R}^8. \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Moreover, since $Q_i P Q_j P = Q_i Q_j$, we still have the equivalent conditions (3.15, 3.17) of $x \in C_A^D$ in the same form as in the indefinite case. In particular,

$$Q_1 Q_2 : \ \mathrm{Span}\{x, Q_1 Q_2 x, \cdots, Q_1 Q_8 x\} \to \mathrm{Span}\{x, Q_1 Q_2 x, \cdots, Q_1 Q_8 x\},$$

which leads to

$$Q_1 Q_2 : \ \mathrm{Span}\{Q_1 Q_3 x, \cdots, Q_1 Q_8 x\} \to \mathrm{Span}\{Q_1 Q_3 x, \cdots, Q_1 Q_8 x\}.$$

Noticing that $Q_1 Q_2$ is an anti-selfadjoint orthogonal transformation, there exists an orthonormal basis $\{v_k, k = 3, \cdots, 8\}$ of $\mathrm{Span}\{Q_1 Q_3 x, \cdots, Q_1 Q_8 x\}$, such that

$$Q_1 Q_2(v_3) = v_6, \ Q_1 Q_2(v_4) = v_7, \ Q_1 Q_2(v_5) = v_8. \tag{3.22}$$

Furthermore, there exists an orthogonal transformation from $\{Q_3, \cdots, Q_8\}$ to $\{Q_3', \cdots, Q_8'\}$ such that $v_k = Q_1 Q_k' x$. For convenience, we still denote Q_k' by Q_k without confusion. Then we can derive from (3.22) that

$$Q_1 Q_2 x = Q_6 Q_3 x = Q_7 Q_4 x = Q_8 Q_5 x, \tag{3.23}$$

and thus

$$x \in E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_6) \cap E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_4Q_7) \cap E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_5Q_8).$$

Next we show that $Q_3Q_4Q_5x, Q_3Q_4Q_8x \in \mathrm{Span}\{Q_1x, Q_2x\}$. By (3.17), it suffices to verify that Q_4Q_5x and Q_4Q_8x are orthogonal to Q_3Q_kx for $k = 3, \ldots, 8$, which can be deduced directly by applying (3.23). Therefore, there exists an orthogonal transformation from $\{Q_1, Q_2\}$ to $\{Q_1', Q_2'\}$ such that $Q_3Q_4Q_5x = Q_1'x$, $Q_3Q_4Q_8x = Q_2'x$. Again, without confusion we denote Q_i' by Q_i. In conclusion, we obtain

$$x \in E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_6) \cap E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_4Q_7) \cap E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_5Q_8) \cap E_+(Q_1Q_3Q_4Q_5).$$

In the following, we prove

Assertion 3.4.1.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Span}\{x_{++}, x_{--}\} \\ = \;& E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_6) \cap E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_4Q_7) \cap E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_5Q_8) \cap E_+(Q_1Q_3Q_4Q_5). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By (3.21), $Q_3Q_6x_{++} \in E_+(Q_0) \cap E_+(P)$ and $Q_1Q_2x_{--} \in E_-(Q_0) \cap E_-(P)$, thus $\langle Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_6x_{++}, x_{--}\rangle = \langle Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_6x_{--}, x_{++}\rangle = 0$. It follows from $Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_6x = x$ that $x_{++}, x_{--} \in E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_6)$. Similarly, $x_{++}, x_{--} \in E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_4Q_7)$, $E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_5Q_8)$, $E_+(Q_1Q_3Q_4Q_5)$.

We are left to prove that the dimension of space $E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_6) \cap E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_4Q_7) \cap E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_5Q_8) \cap E_+(Q_1Q_3Q_4Q_5)$ is 2. We first observe that $Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_6$, $Q_1Q_2Q_4Q_7$ $Q_1Q_2Q_5Q_8$ $Q_1Q_3Q_4Q_5$ are symmetric orthogonal matrices with vanishing traces. Thus their $+1$ eigenspaces have dimension 16. Notice that $E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_6)$ is an invariant space of the anti-commuting operators $Q_1Q_2Q_4Q_7$ and Q_4. Thus $E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_6) \cap E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_4Q_7)$ is of dimension 8 and further it is an invariant space of the anti-commuting operators $Q_1Q_2Q_5Q_8$ and Q_5. Thus $E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_6) \cap E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_4Q_7) \cap E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_5Q_8)$ is of dimension 4. Since Q_1Q_2 commutes with $Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_6$, $Q_1Q_2Q_4Q_7$ $Q_1Q_2Q_5Q_8$ and anti-commutes with $Q_1Q_3Q_4Q_5$, the dimension of the space $E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_6) \cap E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_4Q_7) \cap E_+(Q_1Q_2Q_5Q_8) \cap E_+(Q_1Q_3Q_4Q_5)$ is 2, as desired. □

Notice that $\{Q_0, \cdots, Q_8, P_9\}$ is also a Clifford system on $\mathbb{R}^{32}$. Obviously, P_9 commutes with $Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_6$, $Q_1Q_2Q_4Q_7$, $Q_1Q_2Q_5Q_8$ and $Q_1Q_3Q_4Q_5$ simultaneously, thus Assertion 3.4.1 implies that

$$P_9 : \ \mathrm{Span}\{x_{++}, x_{--}\} \to \mathrm{Span}\{x_{++}, x_{--}\}.$$

Since P_9 anti-commutes with $P = Q_0 \cdots Q_8$, we can assume that $P_9x_{--} = \lambda x_{++}$ with $\lambda \neq 0$, and thus $P_9x_{++} = \lambda^{-1}x_{--}$. Hence we obtain $x = x_{++} + x_{--} \in \mathrm{Span}\{Px, P_9x\}$, that is, $\langle x, Px\rangle^2 + \langle x, P_9x\rangle^2 = 1$.

Conversely, suppose $\langle x, Px\rangle^2 + \langle x, P_9x\rangle^2 = 1$ and $x \in S^{31}(1)$. We need to prepare

Assertion 3.4.2. *For $x \in S^{31}(1)$, $\langle x, Px\rangle^2 + \langle x, P_9x\rangle^2 = 1$ implies $x \in M_-^D$, i.e., $\sum_{i=0}^{8}\langle Px, P_ix\rangle^2 = 1$.*

Proof. If $Px = \pm x$, (3.19) implies that $x \in M_-^D$. So we assume here that $x = x_+ + x_- \in E_+(P) \oplus E_-(P)$ with $x_\pm \neq 0$. Since P_9 anti-commutes with P, we have $P_9x_\pm \in E_\mp(P)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} 1 = \langle x, Px\rangle^2 + \langle x, P_9x\rangle^2 &= (|x_+|^2 - |x_-|^2)^2 + 4\langle x_+, P_9x_-\rangle^2 \\ &\leq (|x_+|^2 - |x_-|^2)^2 + 4|x_+|^2|x_-|^2 = 1, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that

$$P_9x_- = \lambda x_+ \text{ with } \lambda^2 = \frac{|x_-|^2}{|x_+|^2}. \tag{3.24}$$

At the mean time, we decompose $\mathbb{R}^{32}$ again as

$$\mathbb{R}^{32} = (E_+(P)\cap E_+(P_0))\oplus(E_+(P)\cap E_-(P_0))\oplus(E_-(P)\cap E_+(P_0))\oplus(E_-(P)\cap E_-(P_0)),$$

and express $x_+ = x_{++} + x_{+-}$ and $x_- = x_{-+} + x_{--}$ with corresponding indexes. Then it follows from (3.24) and $P_9P_0 = -P_0P_9$ that

$$P_9x_{-+} = \lambda x_{+-},\ P_9x_{--} = \lambda x_{++}, \tag{3.25}$$

which implies

$$|x_{-+}|^2 = \lambda^2|x_{+-}|^2,\ |x_{--}|^2 = \lambda^2|x_{++}|^2. \tag{3.26}$$

If $x_+ \in E_\pm(P_0)$, then $P_0x_- = P_0P_9P_9x_- = \lambda P_0P_9x_+ = -\lambda P_9P_0x_+ = \mp\lambda P_9x_+ = \mp x_-$, and further $P_0Px = P_0P(x_+ + x_-) = P_0(x_+ - x_-) = \pm(x_+ + x_-) = \pm x$, that is, $x \in M_-^D$. Analogously, if $x_- \in E_\pm(P_0)$, we can also get the same conclusion.

Hence we may assume that x_{++}, x_{+-}, x_{-+} and x_{+-} are all non-zero. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} E_+(P)\cap E_+(P_0) &= \mathrm{Span}\{P_1x_{+-}, \cdots, P_8x_{+-}\}, \\ E_+(P)\cap E_-(P_0) &= \mathrm{Span}\{P_1x_{++}, \cdots, P_8x_{++}\}, \\ E_-(P)\cap E_+(P_0) &= \mathrm{Span}\{P_1x_{--}, \cdots, P_8x_{--}\}, \\ E_-(P)\cap E_-(P_0) &= \mathrm{Span}\{P_1x_{-+}, \cdots, P_8x_{-+}\}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we derive that

$$|x_{++}|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{8}\langle x_{++}, P_i\frac{x_{+-}}{|x_{+-}|}\rangle^2,\ |x_{--}|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{8}\langle x_{--}, P_i\frac{x_{-+}}{|x_{-+}|}\rangle^2,$$

and thus

$$\sum_{i=1}^{8}\langle x_{--}, P_ix_{-+}\rangle^2 = |x_{--}|^2|x_{-+}|^2 = \lambda^4|x_{++}|^2|x_{+-}|^2 = \lambda^4\sum_{i=1}^{8}\langle x_{++}, P_ix_{+-}\rangle^2.$$

Therefore, it follows from (3.26) that

$$\langle Px, P_0x\rangle^2 = (|x_{++}|^2 - |x_{+-}|^2 - |x_{-+}|^2 + |x_{--}|^2)^2 = (1+\lambda^2)^2(|x_{++}|^2 - |x_{+-}|^2)^2,$$

and from (3.25) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^{8}\langle Px, P_ix\rangle^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^{8}\langle x_{++} + x_{+-} - x_{-+} - x_{--}, P_i(x_{++} + x_{+-} + x_{-+} + x_{--})\rangle^2 \\
&= 4\sum_{i=1}^{8}(\langle x_{++}, P_ix_{+-}\rangle - \langle x_{--}, P_ix_{-+}\rangle)^2 \\
&= 4\sum_{i=1}^{8}(\langle x_{++}, P_ix_{+-}\rangle + \langle P_9x_{--}, P_iP_9x_{-+}\rangle)^2 \\
&= 4\sum_{i=1}^{8}(1+\lambda^2)^2\langle x_{++}, P_ix_{+-}\rangle^2 \\
&= 4(1+\lambda^2)^2|x_{++}|^2|x_{+-}|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Putting the two equalities above together, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=0}^{8}\langle Px, P_ix\rangle^2 = (1+\lambda^2)^2|x_+|^4 = |x|^4 = 1.$$

The proof of Assertion 3.4.2 is complete now. □

Now we are in a position to show that for $x \in S^{31}(1)$, $\langle x, Px\rangle^2 + \langle x, P_9x\rangle^2 = 1$ implies $x \in C_A^D$. As we have shown $x \in M_-^D$, there exists $Q_0 \in \Sigma(P_0, \cdots, P_8)$ such that $Q_0Px = x$.

If $x \in E_\pm(P) \cap S^{31}(1)$, i.e., $Px = \delta x$ with $\delta = \pm 1$, we have $Q_0x = Px = \delta x$. Hence $x \in E_+(Q_0P) \cap E_\delta(Q_0)$. On the other hand, turning (3.12) to the definite case we get

$$E_-(Q_0P) = T_x^\perp M_-^D \oplus \mathrm{Span}\{Q_1Px, \cdots, Q_8Px\}. \tag{3.27}$$

Furthermore, using a similar argument as before, one can verify that each of $E_\pm(Q_0P) \cap E_\pm(Q_0)$ has dimension 8. Noticing that Q_iP anti-commutes with both Q_0P and Q_0, it can be shown that $\mathrm{Span}\{Q_1Px, \cdots, Q_8Px\} = E_-(Q_0P) \cap E_{-\delta}(Q_0)$, and thus $T_x^\perp M_-^D = E_-(Q_0P) \cap E_\delta(Q_0)$. This argument implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_iPQ_jP: \qquad & \mathrm{Span}\{Q_1Px, \cdots, Q_8Px\} = E_-(Q_0P) \cap E_{-\delta}(Q_0) \\
\to \quad & E_-(Q_0P) \cap E_{-\delta}(Q_0) = \mathrm{Span}\{Q_1Px, \cdots, Q_8Px\},
\end{aligned}$$

for $i, j = 1, \cdots, 8, i \neq j$, which is equivalent to say $x \in C_A^D$ by (3.18).

From now on, we may assume $x = x_+ + x_- \in E_+(P) \oplus E_-(P)$ with $x_\pm \neq 0$. Decompose $\mathbb{R}^{32}$ again as

$$\mathbb{R}^{32} = (E_+(P) \cap E_+(Q_0)) \oplus (E_+(P) \cap E_-(Q_0))$$

$$\oplus \quad (E_-(P)\cap E_+(Q_0))\oplus(E_-(P)\cap E_-(Q_0)),$$

and express $x_+ = x_{++}+x_{+-}$ and $x_- = x_{-+}+x_{--}$ with corresponding indexes. From (3.24), we can also derive that

$$P_9x_{-+} = \lambda x_{+-},\ P_9x_{--} = \lambda x_{++}. \tag{3.28}$$

Since $Q_0x = Px$, we have $x_{+-} = x_{-+} = 0$, i.e., $x = x_{++}+x_{--}$ and $x_{++}\neq 0$, $x_{--}\neq 0$. A simple argument shows

$$\begin{aligned}
E_+(P)\cap E_+(Q_0) &= \mathrm{Span}\{x_{++}, Q_1Q_2x_{++},\cdots,Q_1Q_8x_{++}\},\\
E_+(P)\cap E_-(Q_0) &= \mathrm{Span}\{Q_1x_{++}, Q_2x_{++},\cdots,Q_8x_{++}\},\\
E_-(P)\cap E_+(Q_0) &= \mathrm{Span}\{Q_1x_{--}, Q_2x_{--},\cdots,Q_8x_{--}\},\\
E_-(P)\cap E_-(Q_0) &= \mathrm{Span}\{x_{--}, Q_1Q_2x_{--},\cdots,Q_1Q_8x_{--}\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

Thus it follows from (3.28) and (3.29) that $\langle Q_iPx, Q_jP_9x\rangle = 0$, for any $i,j = 1,\cdots,8$. As it is easy to see $Q_iP_9x\in E_-(Q_0P)$, combining with (3.27), we know

$$T_x^\perp M_-^D = \mathrm{Span}\{Q_1P_9x,\cdots,Q_8P_9x\}. \tag{3.30}$$

Furthermore, since

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_iQ_j = Q_iPQ_jP:\quad & E_+(P)\cap E_-(Q_0)\to E_+(P)\cap E_-(Q_0),\\
& E_-(P)\cap E_+(Q_0)\to E_-(P)\cap E_+(Q_0),
\end{aligned}$$

we obtain that for any $1\le i,j,k,s\le 8$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle Q_iQ_jQ_kP_9x, Q_sPx\rangle &= \langle Q_iQ_jQ_k(\lambda^{-1}x_{--}+\lambda x_{++}), Q_s(x_{++}-x_{--})\rangle\\
&= -\lambda^{-1}\langle Q_iQ_jQ_kx_{--}, Q_sx_{--}\rangle + \lambda\langle Q_iQ_jQ_kx_{++}, Q_sx_{++}\rangle\\
&= -\lambda^{-1}\langle Q_iQ_jQ_kx_{--}, Q_sx_{--}\rangle + \lambda^{-1}\langle Q_iQ_jQ_kP_9x_{--}, Q_sP_9x_{--}\rangle\\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence by using (3.30), we finally obtain

$$Q_iQ_j:\ T_x^\perp M_-^D\to T_x^\perp M_-^D,$$

which implies $x\in C_A^D$. The proof is now complete. □

Corollary 3.2. *C_A^D is isometric to $(S^1(1)\times S^{15}(1))/\mathbb{Z}_2$, diffeomorphic to $S^1\times S^{15}$.*

Proof. Noticing that $\{P, P_9\}$ constitute a Clifford system on $\mathbb{R}^{32}$, the equation $\langle x,Px\rangle^2+\langle x,P_9x\rangle^2 = 1$ characterizes exactly the focal submanifold M_- of the OT-FKM type isoparametric polynomial with respect to this Clifford system. It follows from [TY13] that $C_A^D\cong M_-\cong(S^1(1)\times S^{15}(1))/\mathbb{Z}_2$, where we identify $(t,x)\in S^1(1)\times S^{15}(1)$ with $(-t,-x)$.

To prove the second conclusion, let η be the Hopf line bundle over S^1. Then $(S^1\times S^{15})/\mathbb{Z}_2$ is diffeomorphic to the total space of the sphere bundle of 16η ([TXY12]). As 2η is trivial, $(S^1 \times S^{15})/\mathbb{Z}_2$ is diffeomorphic to $S^1 \times S^{15}$. □

4. The set C_P-Parallel second fundamental form

This section is devoted to the determination of the set C_P, i.e., the set of points at which the covariant derivative of the second fundamental form vanishes, in focal submanifolds of an isoparametric hypersurface in a unit sphere with $g = 4$. As we mentioned before, the isoparametric families with $g = 4$ are either of OT-FKM type or homogeneous with $(2, 2)$, $(4, 5)$. At first, we have

Proposition 4.1. *For the homogeneous case with $(2, 2)$, $C_P = \emptyset$ in the focal submanifold diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}P^3$, and C_P in the focal submanifold diffeomorphic to $\widetilde{G}_2(\mathbb{R}^5)$ is the whole focal submanifold. For the homogeneous case with $(4, 5)$, $C_P = \emptyset$ in both focal submanifolds.*

Proof. Clearly, in $(2, 2)$ case, $2m_2 - m_1 - 2 = 0$, $2m_1 - m_2 - 2 = 0$, the first equality in (1.5) and that in (1.7) both hold, and therefore $C_P = C_E$ in both focal submanifolds. However, by the homogeneity and the classification of Einstein manifolds in [QTY13], C_E is completely determined. More precisely, $C_E = \emptyset$ in the focal submanifold diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{C}P^3$, and C_E in the focal submanifold diffeomorphic to $\widetilde{G}_2(\mathbb{R}^5)$ is the whole focal submanifold. As for the $(4, 5)$ case, it is easy to see that the lower bound of $\rho^\perp$ in (1.7) is bigger than that in (1.5), and thus $C_P = \emptyset$ in both submanifolds, as desired. □

Next, let us turn to M_- of OT-FKM type. We need to prepare the following

Lemma 4.1. *On the focal submanifolds of isoparametric hypersurfaces with $g = 4$, if at some point, the second fundamental form is parallel, so is the Ricci tensor.*

Proof. Recall that the Ricci tensor can be expressed by the shape operators as in (2.6). The conclusion follows at once (cf. [LZ16]). □

Lemma 4.2. *On M_- of OT-FKM type with $m \geq 2$, except for the cases of $(5, 2)$, $(6, 1)$ and $(9, 6)$, the Ricci tensor is not parallel at any point.*

Proof. In Proposition 4.2 of [TY15], except for the cases of $(5, 2)$, $(6, 1)$ and $(9, 6)$, the proof for M_- of OT-FKM type with $m \geq 2$ are not Ricci parallel is actually pointwise. □

Now we are ready to show the following

Proposition 4.2. *On the focal submanifold M_- of OT-FKM type, $C_P = M_-$ for $m = 1$; $C_P = \emptyset$ for $m \geq 2$.*

Proof. Since M_- with $m = 1$ is homogeneous, the first conclusion follows from [LZ16]. When $m \geq 2$, notice that the three cases with $(5, 2)$, $(6, 1)$ and $(9, 6)$ are all homogeneous and [LZ16] showed that M_- in these cases are not parallel. Combining with the two lemmas above, we arrive at that $C_P = \emptyset$ for $m \geq 2$. □

At last, we will conclude this section with the following

Proposition 4.3. *On the focal submanifold M_+ of OT-FKM type, $C_P = M_+$ in $(2, 1)$, $(6, 1)$ cases; $C_P = C_E = M_+$ in the $(4, 3)$ definite case, and $C_P = \emptyset$ in other cases.*

Proof. Comparing the first inequality in (1.5) with that in (1.7), we observe that if $2m_2 - m_1 - 2 = 2(l - m - 1) - m - 2 > 0$, $C_P = \emptyset$ in M_+. So we are only left to deal with $(m_1, m_2) = (1, 1)$, $(2, 1)$, $(4, 3)$, $(5, 2)$, and $(6, 1)$. The $(1, 1)$, $(2, 1)$, $(5, 2)$, and $(6, 1)$ cases are all homogeneous. In $(1, 1)$ case, $C_A = M_+$ as proved in Section 3, i.e. the upper bound of $\rho^\perp$ in (1.5) is achieved, thus $C_P = \emptyset$. It was proved in [LZ16] that $C_P = M_+$ in $(2, 1)$, $(6, 1)$ cases and $C_P = \emptyset$ in $(5, 2)$ case. While in $(4, 3)$ case, $2m_2 - m_1 - 2 = 0$, thus $C_P = C_E$. According to [QTY13], M_+ in the $(4, 3)$ definite case is Einstein, thus we have $C_P = C_E = M_+$. As mentioned in Remark 1.1, the indefinite $(4, 3)$ family is congruent to the $(3, 4)$ family. Thus M_+ in the $(4, 3)$ indefinite case is congruent to M_- with $(3, 4)$, whose $C_P = \emptyset$ as we proved in Proposition 4.2. □

5. The set C_E-Einstein condition

The task of this section is to determine C_E.

Proposition 5.1. *On the focal submanifolds of isoparametric hypersurfaces with $g = 4$, $C_E = M_+$ in M_+ of OT-FKM type with definite $(4, 3)$, C_E in the focal submanifold with homogeneous $(2, 2)$ diffeomorphic to $\widetilde{G}_2(\mathbb{R}^5)$ is the whole focal submanifold, and $C_E = \emptyset$ in other cases.*

Proof. [QTY13] determined which focal submanifolds with $g = 4$ are Einstein among the OT-FKM type and homogeneous $(2, 2)$, $(4, 5)$ cases. Then combining with the classification of isoparametric hypersurfaces in spheres, [QTY13] actually classified completely the Einstein focal submanifolds with $g = 4$. More precisely, except for M_+ of OT-FKM type with definite $(4, 3)$, which is diffeomorphic to $Sp(2)$, and the focal submanifold with $(2, 2)$, which is diffeomorphic to the oriented $\tilde{G}_2(\mathbb{R}^5)$, all the other focal submanifolds are not Einstein.

As for the OT-FKM type, we notice that the proof in Theorem 1.2 (i) in [QTY13] for M_- to be not Einstein is pointwise, thus $C_E = \emptyset$; and except for the five cases listed in formula (15) of [QTY13], the proof for M_+ to be not Einstein is also pointwise,

thus $C_E = \emptyset$. So we only need to calculate C_E in that five cases. Namely, M_+ with multiplicities

$$(m_1, m_2) = (m, l-m-1) = (4,3)(\text{indefinite}), (7,8), (8,7), (9,6), (10,21).$$

As mentioned in Section 4, in M_+ of OT-FKM type with $(4,3)$, $C_P = C_E$, which is $\emptyset$ in the indefinite case by Proposition 4.3. Besides, since M_+ with $(9,6)$ and definite $(8,7)$ are homogeneous, $C_E = \emptyset$ according to the classification in [QTY13]. So we are left to verify pointwisely on M_+ with $(7,8)$, indefinite $(8,7)$ and $(10,21)$.

Recall the expression of Ricci curvature of $X \in T_xM_+$ ([QTY13]):

$$Ric(X) = 2(l-m-2)|X|^2 + 2\sum_{\alpha,\beta=0,\alpha<\beta}^{m} \langle X, P_\alpha P_\beta x\rangle^2.$$

(1) the $(7,8)$ **case**. Let us define $P =: P_0 \cdots P_7$ as before, and a closed subset $D =: \{x \in M_+ \mid Px = \pm x\} \subset M_+$. Given $x \in M_+$, and unit $X \in T_xM_+$, we define a smooth function on the unit tangent bundle $S(TM_+)$:

$$f =: f(x,X) =: \sum_{\alpha,\beta=0,\alpha<\beta}^{7} \langle X, P_\alpha P_\beta x\rangle^2.$$

Furthermore, the function f gives rise to a function g on M_+ by

$$g(x) =: \min_{X\in T_xM_+,\ |X|=1} f(x,X).$$

Clearly, g is a continuous function, since the unit tangent bundle is locally trivial. If $x \in M_+\backslash D$, we choose $X_0 = \frac{Px - \langle Px,x\rangle x}{|Px - \langle Px,x\rangle x|}$. We need to verify that X_0 is a unit tangent vector at x. In fact, it is easy to see $\langle X_0, x\rangle = \langle X_0, P_\alpha x\rangle = 0$, $\alpha = 0, \cdots, 8$, thus $X_0 \in T_xM_+$. Furthermore, $f(x, X_0) = 0$, since $\langle Px, P_\alpha P_\beta x\rangle = \langle x, P_\alpha P_\beta x\rangle = 0$ for $\alpha \neq \beta$. This means that $g|_{M_+\backslash D} \equiv 0$. Noticing that $M_+\backslash D$ in M_+ is open and dense, we obtain $g(x) \equiv 0$. However, by the definition, $\max\limits_{X\in T_xM_+,\ |X|=1} f(x,X) \geq 1$. Therefore, at any $x \in M_+$, $f(x,X)$ is not constant. In other words, $C_E = \emptyset$ in M_+.

(2) the indefinite $(8,7)$ **case.** Without loss of generality, we first give a concrete expression of Clifford system on $\mathbb{R}^{32} \cong \mathbb{O}^4$. Write $x \in \mathbb{R}^{32}$ as $x = (u,v) = (u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{O}^4$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} &P_0 x = (u_1, u_2, -v_1, -v_2),\ P_1 x = (v_1, v_2, u_1, u_2),\\ &P_{1+\alpha} x = (e_\alpha v_1, -e_\alpha v_2, -e_\alpha u_1, e_\alpha u_2),\ \alpha = 1, \cdots, 7, \end{aligned}$$

where $\{1, e_1, e_2, \cdots, e_7\}$ is the standard orthonormal basis of the octonions (Cayley numbers) $\mathbb{O}$ as before.

Lemma 5.1. $P_0 \cdots P_8 x = (-u_1, u_2, -v_1, v_2)$.

The proof is similar to that of Assertion 3.3.3 in Section 3, and is omitted here. One can verify without much difficulty that $x \in M_+$ if and only if

$$|u|^2 = |v|^2 = 1/2,\ \mathrm{Re}(u_1\bar{v}_1 + u_2\bar{v}_2) = 0,\ \mathrm{Im}(u_1\bar{v}_1 - u_2\bar{v}_2) = 0. \tag{5.1}$$

The last two equalities imply that $u_1\bar{v}_1 + v_2\bar{u}_2 = 0$. Thus $|u_1| = |v_2|$ and $|u_2| = |v_1|$, which lead to

$$\langle P_0 \cdots P_8 x, x\rangle = -|u_1|^2 + |u_2|^2 - |v_1|^2 + |v_2|^2 = 0 \tag{5.2}$$

by the preceding lemma. Define a closed subset $D' =: \{x \in M_+ \mid P_1 \cdots P_8 x = \pm x\} \subset M_+$. Notice that D' has measure zero in M_+ since $P_1 \cdots P_8 x = \pm x$ will lead to $u_1 = v_2 = 0$ or $u_2 = v_1 = 0$. Analogously as in the $(7, 8)$ case, given $x \in M_+$, and unit $X \in T_x M_+$, we define a smooth function on the unit tangent bundle $S(TM_+)$:

$$f =: f(x, X) =: \sum_{\alpha,\beta=0,\alpha<\beta}^{8} \langle X, P_\alpha P_\beta x\rangle^2.$$

Thus f gives rise to functions g and G on M_+ by

$$g(x) =: \min_{X\in T_x M_+,\ |X|=1} f(x, X), \quad G(x) = \max_{X\in T_x M_+,\ |X|=1} f(x, X).$$

Again, g and G are continuous, since the unit tangent bundle is locally trivial. If $x \in M_+\backslash D'$, we choose

$$X_0 = \frac{P_1 \cdots P_8 x - \langle P_1 \cdots P_8 x, x\rangle x}{|P_1 \cdots P_8 x - \langle P_1 \cdots P_8 x, x\rangle x|}.$$

It is easy to see that $X_0 \in T_x M_+$, since $\langle X_0, x\rangle = 0$, $\langle X_0, P_0 x\rangle = 0$ by (5.2) and $\langle X_0, P_\beta x\rangle = 0$, $\beta = 1, \cdots, 8$. Furthermore, it follows from (5.1) and Lemma 5.1 that

$$|P_1 \cdots P_8 x - \langle P_1 \cdots P_8 x, x\rangle x|^2 = 1 - \langle P_1 \cdots P_8 x, x\rangle^2 = 16|u_1|^2|v_1|^2,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\alpha,\beta=0,\alpha<\beta}^{8} \langle P_1 \cdots P_8 x, P_\alpha P_\beta x\rangle^2 &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^{8} \langle P_1 \cdots P_8 x, P_0 P_\alpha x\rangle^2 \\
&= \langle P_0 \cdots P_8 x, P_1 x\rangle^2 + \sum_{\alpha=2}^{8} \langle P_0 \cdots P_8 x, P_\alpha x\rangle^2 \\
&= 4|\mathrm{Re}(u_1\bar{v}_1 - u_2\bar{v}_2)|^2 + 4|\mathrm{Im}(u_1\bar{v}_1 + u_2\bar{v}_2)|^2 \\
&= 4|u_1\bar{v}_1 - u_2\bar{v}_2|^2 + 4|u_1\bar{v}_1 + u_2\bar{v}_2|^2 \\
&= 16|u_1|^2|v_1|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

thus $f(x, X_0) = 1$. This means that $g|_{M_+\backslash D'} \le 1$ and thus $g(x) \le 1$ on M_+ by continuity.

On the other hand, it is obvious that $G(x) \ge 1$ since $P_\alpha P_\beta x$ are unit tangent vectors. In fact, we have $G(x) > 1$ on M_+. Otherwise, suppose $f(x, X) \le 1$ for any $X \in S(T_x M_+)$ at some $x \in M_+$. Then for any two distinct pairs (α, β) and (γ, δ),

$P_\alpha P_\beta x$ and $P_\gamma P_\delta x$ must be perpendicular to each other, which is impossible since $\sharp\{(\alpha,\beta) \mid 0 \le \alpha < \beta \le 8\} = 36 > \dim M_+ = 22$.

If f is constant at some point $x \in M_+$, then $1 < G(x) = g(x) \le 1$, an obvious contradiction. Therefore, $C_E = \emptyset$ in M_+.

(3) the $(10, 21)$ **case**. Let $\dim M_+ = 52 =: p$ and $\sharp\{(\alpha,\beta) \mid 0 \le \alpha < \beta \le 10\} = 55 =: q$ for the sake of convenience. Given $x \in M_+$, choosing an orthonormal basis of T_xM_+, we can identify T_xM_+ with the Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^p$. In this way, the unit vectors $P_0P_1x, P_0P_2x, \cdots, P_0P_{10}x, P_1P_2x, \cdots, P_9P_{10}x$ become unit vectors $b_1, \cdots, b_q$ in $\mathbb{R}^p$. Write $b_i = (b_{i1}, \cdots, b_{ip})$ with $i = 1, \cdots, q$, thus we obtain a matrix $B = (b_{ij})_{q\times p}$. Define a function

$$f(X) =: \sum_{i=1}^{q} \langle X, b_i\rangle^2 \ for\ X \in S^{p-1}(1).$$

Clearly, $x \in C_E$ if and only if the function f is a constant. On the other hand, f is a quadratic form with respect to the symmetric matrix $\sum_{i=1}^q b_i^t b_i = B^tB$, thereby

$$f \equiv Const =: c \ \Leftrightarrow\ B^tB = cI_p.$$

As b_i's are unit vectors, by taking trace we see $c = \frac{q}{p}$ and thus f is a constant if and only if

$$\langle (b_{1i}, \cdots, b_{qi})^t, (b_{1j}, \cdots, b_{qj})^t\rangle = \delta_{ij}\frac{q}{p},\ for\ i, j = 1, \cdots, p.$$

It is easily seen that the matrix $\sqrt{p/q}B$ can be extended to an orthogonal matrix, say $C = (c_{ij})_{q\times q}$. Since $\langle b_\alpha, b_\beta\rangle = \langle P_0P_\alpha x, P_0P_\beta x\rangle = 0$ for any $\alpha \ne \beta$, $\alpha, \beta = 1, \cdots, 10$, it follows from $CC^t = C^tC = I_q$ that the vectors $\beta_1, \cdots, \beta_{10} \in \mathbb{R}^{q-p}$ defined by $\beta_i = (c_{i(q-2)}, c_{i(q-1)}, c_{iq})$ $(i = 1, \cdots, 10)$ satisfy $|\beta_1|^2 = \cdots = |\beta_{10}|^2 = 1 - p/q$ and $\langle \beta_i, \beta_j\rangle = 0$ for any $i \ne j, i, j = 1, \cdots, 10$. However, this is impossible. Therefore, $C_E = \emptyset$ in this case. □

Remark 5.1. *In* [QTY13]*, they gave a sufficient condition on* M_+ *for* $x \notin C_E$*. More precisely,* x *does not belong to* C_E *if* $\dim M_+ > \binom{m+1}{2}$*. Without difficulty, the arguments in the* $(10, 21)$ *case above can weaken the sufficient condition to* $\dim M_+ > \binom{m+1}{2} - m$*.*

6. The focal submanifolds with $g = 4$ and multiplicities $(8, 7)$

The purpose of this section is to give a proof of Proposition 1.2 concerning the isoparametric family of OT-FKM type with multiplicities $(8, 7)$. At first, we define a function h on M_-^I by $h(x) = \langle Px, x\rangle$, where $P =: P_0 \cdots P_8$ as defined in the introduction. We will show

Lemma 6.1. *h is an isoparametric function on M_-^I satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} |\nabla^I h|^2 = 4(1 - h^2) \\ \Delta^I h = -32h, \end{cases}$$

where $\nabla^I h$ and $\Delta^I h$ are the gradient and Laplacian of h on M^I_- with the induced metric from $S^{31}(1)$.

Proof. We still make use of the notations in Subsection 3.4. At first, it is easy to see that

$$\frac{1}{2}\nabla^I h = (Px)^T = Px - \langle Px, x\rangle x - \sum_{\alpha=1}^{8}\langle Px, N_\alpha\rangle N_\alpha,$$

where $N_1, \cdots, N_8$ is an orthonormal basis of $T^\perp_x M^I_-$ in $T_x S^{31}(1)$.

Given $x \in M_-$ and $Q_0 \in \Sigma(P_0, \cdots, P_8)$ with $Q_0 x = x$, we can extend Q_0 to such a symmetric Clifford system $\{Q_0, Q_1, \cdots, Q_8\}$ with $Q_i \in \Sigma_{Q_0}$ $(i \geq 1)$ that $\Sigma(Q_0, Q_1, \cdots, Q_8) = \Sigma(P_0, P_1, \cdots, P_8)$ and $P = P_0 \cdots P_8 = Q_0 \cdots Q_8$. Thus we obtain

$$\langle Px, N_\alpha\rangle N_\alpha = \langle Q_1 \cdots Q_8 x, N_\alpha\rangle N_\alpha.$$

Clearly, the interpretation (3.12) tells that $x \in E_+(Q_0)$ and $N_\alpha \in E_-(Q_0)$. Thus combining with the property that Q_i $(i \geq 1)$ maps $E_\pm(Q_0)$ to $E_\mp(Q_0)$, we derive that $Q_1 \cdots Q_8 x \in E_+(Q_0)$, which leads to $\langle Q_1 \cdots Q_8 x, N_\alpha\rangle = 0$. Therefore, the arguments above imply

$$\frac{1}{2}\nabla^I h = Px - \langle Px, x\rangle x.$$

In particular,

$$|\nabla^I h|^2 = 4(1 - h^2).$$

Next, we turn to calculate the laplacian, i.e., the trace of Hessian $Hess^I_h$:

$$\begin{aligned} Hess^I_h(X, Y) &= \langle \nabla^I_X \nabla^I h, Y\rangle = 2\langle D_X(Px - hx), Y\rangle \\ &= 2\langle PX - hX, Y\rangle, \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

for $X, Y \in T_x M^I_-$, where ∇^I and D are the Levi-Civita connections on M^I_- and $\mathbb{R}^{32}$, respectively. Notice that $\mathrm{Trace}P = \mathrm{Trace}(P_0 \cdots P_8) = 0$ in the indefinite case. By virtue of the orthonormal basis (3.11) given in [TY15], for any given $i = 1, \cdots, 8$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathrm{Trace}P \\ &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^{8}\langle PN_\alpha, N_\alpha\rangle + \sum_{j=1}^{8}\langle PQ_j x, Q_j x\rangle + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{8}\langle PQ_i N_\alpha, Q_i N_\alpha\rangle + \sum_{j=1}^{8}\langle PQ_i Q_j x, Q_i Q_j x\rangle \\ &= 2\sum_{\alpha=1}^{8}\langle PN_\alpha, N_\alpha\rangle + 16h, \end{aligned}$$

which implies $8h = -\sum_{\alpha=1}^{8}\langle PN_\alpha, N_\alpha\rangle$. Substituting this into the expression of $\Delta^I h$, we get

$$\Delta^I h = -32h.$$

Thus h is an isoparametric function on M_-^I. Furthermore, the focal variety of h is $h^{-1}(1) \cup h^{-1}(-1) = (E_+(P) \cap M_-^I) \cup (E_-(P) \cap M_-^I) = S^{15}(1) \sqcup S^{15}(1) = C_A^I$ by Proposition 3.4. □

For the definite case, as in the introduction, we will use the symmetric Clifford system $\{\tilde{P}_0 =: P_0P, \cdots, \tilde{P}_8 =: P_8P\}$. Define the function $\tilde{h}$ on M_-^D by $\tilde{h}(x) = \langle Px, x\rangle$ with $P =: P_0 \cdots P_8$. It should be reminded that h and $\tilde{h}$ have the same expression but different domains. Then the same arguments as above lead us to

Lemma 6.2. *$\tilde{h}$ is an isoparametric function on M_-^D satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} |\nabla^D \tilde{h}|^2 = 4(1 - \tilde{h}^2) \\ \Delta^D \tilde{h} = -32\tilde{h}, \end{cases}$$

where $\nabla^D \tilde{h}$ and $\Delta^D \tilde{h}$ are the gradient and Laplacian of $\tilde{h}$ on M_-^D with the induced metric from $S^{31}(1)$. The focal variety of $\tilde{h}$ is $\tilde{h}^{-1}(1) \cup \tilde{h}^{-1}(-1) = (E_+(P) \cap M_-^D) \cup (E_-(P) \cap M_-^D) = S^{15}(1) \sqcup S^{15}(1)$ by Proposition 3.4. □

Remark 6.1. *According to* [Wan87] *or* [GT13]*, the existence of the isoparametric function h on M_-^I with focal variety $S^{15}(1) \sqcup S^{15}(1)$ gives rise to a decomposition of the manifold M_-^I. More precisely, M_-^I is a union of two D^8-bundles over S^{15}. There exists the same decomposition on M_-^D. However, by Corollary 1 in* [Wan88]*, M_-^I is diffeomorphic to $S^8 \times S^{15}$. By* [FKM81] *or* [Wan88]*, M_-^D is an S^8 bundle over S^{15}. But according to Theorem 1 in* [Wan88]*, M_-^I and M_-^D are not homeomorphic.*

As the last part of this paper, we want to show that both of $M_+^I \hookrightarrow M_-^D$ and $M_+^D \hookrightarrow M_-^I$ are totally isoparametric and austere hypersurfaces. For the convenience of notations, we will only prove the case $M_+^I \hookrightarrow M_-^D$, as the proof of the other will use the same method, just replacing P_α and $\tilde{P}_\alpha =: P_\alpha P$ with $\tilde{P}_\alpha$ and P_α, respectively.

The first step is to establish

Lemma 6.3. *$M_+^I = \tilde{h}^{-1}(0) \hookrightarrow M_-^D$ is an isoparametric hypersurface.*

Proof. We only need to show $M_+^I \subset M_-^D$, since then for $x \in M_+^I$, $\tilde{h}(x) = \langle Px, x\rangle = \langle Px, Q_0Px\rangle = \langle x, Q_0x\rangle = 0$, i.e., $M_+^I \subset \tilde{h}^{-1}(0)$; and conversely for $x \in \tilde{h}^{-1}(0) \subset M_-^D$, $\langle Q_ix, x\rangle = \langle Q_ix, Q_0Px\rangle = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 8$ and $\langle Q_0x, x\rangle = \langle Q_0x, Q_0Px\rangle = \tilde{h}(x) = 0$, thus $\tilde{h}^{-1}(0) \subset M_+^I$.

By a similar argument as in Proposition 3.5, we decompose $\mathbb{R}^{32}$ as the direct sum of four 8-dimensional subspaces :

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{R}^{32} = E_+(P_0) \oplus E_-(P_0) \\ = \ & (E_+(P_0) \cap E_+(P)) \oplus (E_+(P_0) \cap E_-(P)) \oplus (E_-(P_0) \cap E_+(P)) \oplus (E_-(P_0) \cap E_-(P)), \end{aligned}$$

and write $x \in S^{31}(1)$ as $x = x_+ + x_- = x_{++} + x_{+-} + x_{-+} + x_{--}$ with corresponding indexes. Given $x \in M_+^I \subset S^{31}(1)$, the property $\langle P_0 x, x\rangle = 0$ indicates that $|x_+|^2 = |x_-|^2 = \frac{1}{2}$, and $\langle P_\alpha x, x\rangle = 0$ ($\alpha \geq 1$) indicates that $\langle P_\alpha x_+, x_-\rangle = 0$ and further

$$\langle P_\alpha x_{++}, x_{-+}\rangle + \langle P_\alpha x_{+-}, x_{--}\rangle = 0, \tag{6.2}$$

since $P_\alpha P_0 + P_0 P_\alpha = 0$ and $P_\alpha P = P P_\alpha$ for $\alpha \geq 1$.

Clearly, if $x_{++} = 0$, then $x_{+-} = x_+ \neq 0$, and $\mathrm{Span}\{P_1 x_{+-}, \cdots, P_8 x_{+-}\} = E_-(P_0) \cap E_-(P)$ for dimensional reason. It follows from (6.2) that $x_{--} = 0$. Hence

$$Px = P(x_{+-} + x_{-+}) = -x_{+-} + x_{-+} = -P_0(x_{+-} + x_{-+}) = -P_0 x,$$

which indicates that $-P_0 P x = x$, and thus $x \in M_-^D$. Analogously, if any one of x_{+-}, x_{-+} and x_{--} vanishes, we can also show $x \in M_-^D$ by the same way.

Now suppose none of x_{++}, x_{+-}, x_{-+} and x_{--} is zero. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Span}\{P_1 x_{-+}, \cdots, P_8 x_{-+}\} &= E_+(P_0) \cap E_+(P),\\
\mathrm{Span}\{P_1 x_{--}, \cdots, P_8 x_{--}\} &= E_+(P_0) \cap E_-(P),\\
\mathrm{Span}\{P_1 x_{++}, \cdots, P_8 x_{++}\} &= E_-(P_0) \cap E_+(P),\\
\mathrm{Span}\{P_1 x_{+-}, \cdots, P_8 x_{+-}\} &= E_-(P_0) \cap E_-(P),
\end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
x_{++} &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^{8} \langle x_{++}, P_\alpha \frac{x_{-+}}{|x_{-+}|}\rangle P_\alpha \frac{x_{-+}}{|x_{-+}|}, \qquad x_{+-} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{8} \langle x_{+-}, P_\alpha \frac{x_{--}}{|x_{--}|}\rangle P_\alpha \frac{x_{--}}{|x_{--}|},\\
x_{-+} &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^{8} \langle x_{-+}, P_\alpha \frac{x_{++}}{|x_{++}|}\rangle P_\alpha \frac{x_{++}}{|x_{++}|}, \qquad x_{--} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{8} \langle x_{--}, P_\alpha \frac{x_{+-}}{|x_{+-}|}\rangle P_\alpha \frac{x_{+-}}{|x_{+-}|},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$|x_{++}|^2 |x_{-+}|^2 = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{8} \langle x_{++}, P_\alpha x_{-+}\rangle^2, \quad |x_{+-}|^2 |x_{--}|^2 = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{8} \langle x_{+-}, P_\alpha x_{--}\rangle^2.$$

Substituting these into (6.2), we obtain

$$|x_{++}|^2 = |x_{--}|^2 =: a, \quad |x_{+-}|^2 = |x_{-+}|^2 =: b, \text{ with } a + b = \frac{1}{2},$$

which implies directly that $\tilde{h}(x) = \langle Px, x\rangle = |x_{++}|^2 - |x_{+-}|^2 + |x_{-+}|^2 - |x_{--}|^2 = 0$. Besides, a further calculation shows $\langle P_0 x, Px\rangle = 2(a - b)$ and

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^{8} \langle P_\alpha x, Px\rangle^2 = 16 \sum_{\alpha=1}^{8} \langle x_{++}, P_\alpha x_{-+}\rangle^2 = 16ab,$$

which lead us to $\sum_{\alpha=0}^{8} \langle P_\alpha x, Px\rangle^2 = 4(a+b)^2 = 1$, i.e., $x \in M_-^D$.

In conclusion, $M_+^I = \tilde{h}^{-1}(0) \hookrightarrow M_-^D$ is an isoparametric hypersurface in M_-^D by Lemma 6.2. □

Remark 6.2. *Using the same method, we can also prove that $M_+^D = h^{-1}(0) \hookrightarrow M_-^I$ is an isoparametric hypersurface in M_-^I.*

Our final task is to prove

Lemma 6.4. *$M_+^I \hookrightarrow M_-^D$ is a totally isoparametric, austere hypersurface in M_-^D.*

Proof. We have proved that $M_+^I \hookrightarrow M_-^D$ is an isoparametric hypersurface. According to [GTY15], to prove that $M_+^I \hookrightarrow M_-^D$ is totally isoparametric, it suffices to prove that the eigenvalues of $Hess_{\tilde{h}}$ are constant on any regular level set of $\tilde{h}$.

Given $x \in M_-^D$ with $Q_0Px = x$, as in (3.12), we would like to represent $E_\pm(Q_0P)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} E_-(Q_0P) &= \mathrm{Span}\{N_1, \cdots, N_8,\ Q_1Px, \cdots, Q_8Px\} \\ E_+(Q_0P) &= \mathrm{Span}\{Q_1PN_1, \cdots, Q_1PN_8,\ x, Q_1Q_2x, \cdots, Q_1Q_8x\}. \end{aligned}$$

In fact, as we mentioned in Subsection 3.4, $\{N_1, \cdots, N_8\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $T_x^\perp M_-^D$, and $\{Q_1Px, \cdots, Q_8Px, Q_1PN_1, \cdots, Q_1PN_8, Q_1Q_2x, \cdots, Q_1Q_8x\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $T_xM_-^D$.

Under an appropriate arrangement of the orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{R}^{32} = T_xM_-^D \oplus T_x^\perp M_-^D \oplus \mathrm{Span}\{x\}$, we can split the matrix P into block form (up to an adjoint transformation by an orthogonal matrix) as

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \begin{pmatrix} \langle PQ_iPx, Q_jPx\rangle & \langle PQ_iPx, Q_1PN_\alpha\rangle & \langle PQ_iPx, Q_1Q_jx\rangle & \langle PQ_iPx, N_\alpha\rangle \\ \langle PQ_1PN_\beta, Q_jPx\rangle & \langle PQ_1PN_\beta, Q_1PN_\alpha\rangle & \langle PQ_1PN_\beta, Q_1Q_jx\rangle & \langle PQ_1PN_\beta, N_\alpha\rangle \\ \langle PQ_1Q_ix, Q_jPx\rangle & \langle PQ_1Q_ix, Q_1PN_\alpha\rangle & \langle PQ_1Q_ix, Q_1Q_jx\rangle & \langle PQ_1Q_ix, N_\alpha\rangle \\ \langle PN_\beta, Q_jPx\rangle & \langle PN_\beta, Q_1PN_\alpha\rangle & \langle PN_\beta, Q_1Q_jx\rangle & \langle PN_\beta, N_\alpha\rangle \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{h}I_8 & 0 & 0 & U \\ 0 & \mathcal{P}_\perp & U^t & 0 \\ 0 & U & \tilde{h}I_8 & 0 \\ U^t & 0 & 0 & \mathcal{P}_\perp \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where $i, j, \alpha, \beta = 1, \cdots, 8$ and $U =: (\langle Q_ix, N_\alpha\rangle)_{8\times 8}$, $\mathcal{P}_\perp =: (\langle PN_\alpha, N_\beta\rangle)_{8\times 8}$. Here the second equality follows from the equality $Q_0Px = x$ and the property that Q_i maps $E_\pm(Q_0P)$ to $E_\mp(Q_0P)$ $(i \geq 1)$. On the other hand, from

$$\begin{aligned} I_{32} &= P^2 \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{h}^2I_8 + UU^t & 0 & 0 & \tilde{h}U + U\mathcal{P}_\perp \\ 0 & (\mathcal{P}_\perp)^2 + U^tU & (\mathcal{P}_\perp)U^t + \tilde{h}U^t & 0 \\ 0 & U(\mathcal{P}_\perp) + \tilde{h}U & UU^t + \tilde{h}^2I_8 & 0 \\ \tilde{h}U^t + (\mathcal{P}_\perp)U^t & 0 & 0 & U^tU + (\mathcal{P}_\perp)^2 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

we derive that $UU^t = (1-\tilde{h}^2)I_8$, $(\mathcal{P}_\perp)^2 + U^tU = I_8$ and $(\mathcal{P}_\perp + \tilde{h}I_8)U^t = 0$. Since we need only to calculate $Hess_{\tilde{h}}$ on the regular level sets, i.e., on the points with $\tilde{h}^2 < 1$, we are guaranteed that rank$U = 8$ and $\mathcal{P}_\perp = -\tilde{h}I_8$, which leaves us to

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{h}I_8 & 0 & 0 & U \\ 0 & -\tilde{h}I_8 & U^t & 0 \\ 0 & U & \tilde{h}I_8 & 0 \\ U^t & 0 & 0 & -\tilde{h}I_8 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We decompose $U_{8\times 8}$ as

$$U_{8\times 8} = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ (U_1)_{7\times 8} \end{pmatrix},$$

with $u = (\langle Px, Q_1PN_1\rangle, \cdots, \langle Px, Q_1PN_8\rangle)$. Restricting on $T_xM_-^D$ with $\tilde{h}^2(x) < 1$, the matrix of the quadratic form associated with P can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{P}_\top = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{h}I_8 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\tilde{h}I_8 & U_1^t \\ 0 & U_1 & \tilde{h}I_7 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now we are going to calculate the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{P}_\top$ by computing

$$\det(\lambda I_{23} - \mathcal{P}_\top) = \begin{vmatrix} (\lambda-\tilde{h})I_8 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (\lambda+\tilde{h})I_8 & -U_1^t \\ 0 & -U_1 & (\lambda-\tilde{h})I_7 \end{vmatrix}.$$

Obviously, $\lambda = \tilde{h}$ is an eigenvalue of $\mathcal{P}_\top$ with multiplicity at least 8. When $\lambda \neq \tilde{h}$, we see

$$\begin{vmatrix} (\lambda+\tilde{h})I_8 & -U_1^t \\ -U_1 & (\lambda-\tilde{h})I_7 \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} (\lambda+\tilde{h})I_8 - (\lambda-\tilde{h})^{-1}U_1^tU_1 & 0 \\ -U_1 & (\lambda-\tilde{h})I_7 \end{vmatrix} = (\lambda+\tilde{h})(\lambda^2-1)^7.$$

Thus, $\det(\lambda I_{23} - \mathcal{P}_\top) = (\lambda-\tilde{h})^8(\lambda+\tilde{h})(\lambda+1)^7(\lambda-1)^7$ for any λ. Namely, the eigenvalues of $\mathcal{P}_\top$ on any regular level set of $\tilde{h}$ are constant. Equivalently, for any k, Trace$(\mathcal{P}_\top)^k$ is constant on the regular level sets of $\tilde{h}$. Recalling (6.1), we have proved that the eigenvalues of $Hess_{\tilde{h}}$ are constant.

Therefore, $M_+^I \hookrightarrow M_-^D$ is a totally isoparametric hypersurface. At the mean time, we notice that $\frac{\nabla^D\tilde{h}}{|\nabla^D\tilde{h}|}$ is a unit normal of M_+^I in M_-^D, while M_+^I and M_-^D are both submanifolds in $S^{31}(1)$. Therefore, the eigenvalues of the shape operator associated with $\frac{\nabla^D\tilde{h}}{|\nabla^D\tilde{h}|}$ on M_+^I are the same as those in $S^{31}(1)$, i.e., $1, -1$ with multiplicity 7 and 0 with multiplicity 8, which makes M_+^I an austere hypersurface in M_-^D. □

Acknowledgements . *The authors would like to thank Professors R. Miyaoka and Q. S. Chi for their interest and helpful comments.*

References

[CCJ07] T. E. Cecil, Q. S. Chi, and G. R. Jensen, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces with four principal curvatures*, Ann. Math. **166** (2007), no. 1, 1–76.

[CdK70] S. S. Chern, M. do Carmo and S. Kobayashi, *Minimal submanifolds of the sphere with second fundamental form of constant length*, in: F. Browder (Ed.), Functional Analysis and Related Fields, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1970.

[Chi12] Q.S. Chi,*A new look at condition A*, Osaka J. Math. **49** (2012), no. 1, 133–166.

[Chi13] Q.S. Chi, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces with four principal curvatures, III*, J. Diff. Geom. **94** (2013), 487–522.

[Chi15] Q. S. Chi, *Ideal theory and classification of isoparametric hypersurfaces*, Contemp. Math. **646**(2015), 81–104, A. M. S.

[Chi16] Q. S. Chi, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces with four principal curvatures, IV*, arXiv: 1605.00976, 2016.

[CL08] T. Choi and Z.Q. Lu, *On the DDVV conjecture and the comass in calibrated geometry, I*, Math. Z. **260** (2008), no. 2, 409–429.

[CR85] T. E. Cecil and P. T. Ryan, *Tight and taut immersions of manifolds*, Research Notes in Math. **107**, Pitman, London, 1985.

[DT09] M. Dajczer and R. Tojeiro, *Submanifolds of codimension two attaining equality in an extrinsic inequality*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **146** (2009), no. 2, 461–474.

[DDVV99] P.J. De Smet, F. Dillen, L. Verstraelen and L. Vrancken, *A pointwise inequality in submanifold theory*, Arch. Math. (Brno), **35** (1999), no. 2, 115–128.

[DN83] J. Dorfmeister and E. Neher, *Isoparametric triple systems of algebra type*, Osaka J. Math. **20** (1983), 145–175.

[DN83'] J. Dorfmeister and E. Neher, *Isoparametric triple systems of FKM-type II*, Manuscripta Math. **43**(1983), 13–44.

[DN85] J. Dorfmeister and E. Neher, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces, case* $g = 6, m = 1$, Comm. in Algebra **13** (1985), 2299–2368.

[FKM81] D. Ferus, H. Karcher, and H. F. Münzner, *Cliffordalgebren und neue isoparametrische Hyperflächen*, Math. Z. **177** (1981), 479–502.

[GT08] J. Q. Ge and Z. Z. Tang, *A proof of the DDVV conjecture and its equality case*, Pacific J. Math. **237** (2008), no. 1, 87–95.

[GT13] J. Q. Ge and Z. Z. Tang, *Isoparametric functions and exotic spheres*, J. reine angew. Math. **683** (2013), 161–180.

[GTY15] J. Q. Ge, Z. Z. Tang and W. J. Yan, *A filtration for isoparametric hypersurfaces in Riemannian manifolds*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **67** (2015), 1179–1212.

[HL82] R. Harvey and B. Lawson, *Calibrated geometries*, Acta Math. **148** (1982), 47–157.

[Hus75] D. Husemoller, *Fibre Bundles,* Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. **20**, Springer-Verlag, 1975.

[KT68] S. Kobayashl and M. Takeuchi, *Minimal imbeddings of R-spaces*, J. Diff. Geom. **2** (1968), 203–215.

[LZ16] Q. C. Li and L. Zhang, *On focal submanifolds of isoparametric hypersurfaces and Simons formula*, Results Math. **70** (2016), no. 1-2, 183–195.

[Lu11] Z. Q. Lu, *Normal scalar curvature conjecture and its applications*, J. Funct. Anal. **261** (2011), no. 5, 1284–1308.

[Miy93] R. Miyaoka, *The linear isotropy group of* $G_2/SO(4)$*, the Hopf fibering and isoparametric hypersurfaces*, Osaka J. Math. **30** (1993), 179–202.

[Miy13] R. Miyaoka, *Isoparametric hypersurfaces with (g,m) = (6,2)*, Ann. Math. **177** (2013), 53–110.

[Miy16] R. Miyaoka, *Errata of " isoparametric hypersurfaces with (g, m) = (6, 2) "*, Ann. Math. **183** (2016), 1057-1071.

[Mün80, 81] H. F. Münzner, *Isoparametrische Hyperflächen in Sphären, I and II*, Math. Ann. **251** (1980), 57–71 and **256** (1981), 215–232.

[OT75] H. Ozeki and M. Takeuchi, *On some types of isoparametric hypersurfaces in spheres, I*, Tôhoku Math. J. **27** (1975), 515–559.

[OT76] H. Ozeki and M. Takeuchi, *On some types of isoparametric hypersurfaces in spheres, II*, Tôhoku Math. J. **28** (1976), 7–55.

[QT15] C. Qian and Z. Z. Tang, *Isoparametric functions on exotic spheres*, Adv. Math. **272** (2015), 611–629.

[QT16] C. Qian and Z. Z. Tang, *Isoparametric foliations, a problem of Eells-Lemaire and conjectures of Leung*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **112** (2016), 979–1001.

[QTY13] C. Qian, Z. Z. Tang and W. J. Yan, *New examples of Willmore submanifolds in the unit sphere via isoparametric functions, II*, Ann. Glob. Anal. Geom. **43** (2013), 47–62.

[Sim68] J. Simons, *Minimal varieties in riemannian manifolds*, Ann. Math. **88** (1968), no. 2, 62–105.

[TXY12] Z. Z. Tang, Y. Q. Xie and W. J. Yan, *Schoen-Yau-Gromov-Lawson theory and isoparametric foliations*, Comm. Anal. Geom. **20** (2012), 989–1018.

[TY13] Z. Z. Tang and W. J. Yan, *Isoparametric foliation and Yau conjecture on the first eigenvalue*, J. Diff. Geom., **94**(2013), 521–540.

[TY15] Z .Z. Tang and W. J. Yan, *Isoparametric foliation and a problem of Besse on generalizations of Einstein condition*, Adv. Math. **285** (2015), 1970–2000.

[Wan87] Q.M. Wang, *Isoparametric Functions on Riemannian Manifolds. I*, Math. Ann. **277** (1987), 639–646.

[Wan88] Q. M. Wang, *On the topology of Clifford Isoparametric hypersurfaces*, J. Diff. Geom. **27** (1988) 55–66.

[Xie15] Y. Q. Xie, *Willmore submanifolds in the unit sphere via isoparametric functions*, Acta Math. Sinica, **31** (2015), 1963–1969.

[XLMW14] Z.X. Xie, T.Z. Li, X. Ma and C.P. Wang, *Möbius geometry of three-dimensional Wintgen ideal submanifolds in* $\mathbb{S}^5$, Sci. China Math. **57** (2014), no. 6, 1203–1220.

[Yau82] S. T. Yau, *Seminar on differential geometry*, problem section, Ann. Math. Studies 102, Princeton Univ. Press, 1982.

School of Mathematical Sciences, Laboratory of Mathematics and Complex Systems, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, P. R. China

E-mail address: jqge@bnu.edu.cn

Chern Institute of Mathematics and LPMC, Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, P. R. China

E-mail address: zztang@mx.cei.gov.cn

School of Mathematical Sciences, Laboratory of Mathematics and Complex Systems, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, P. R. China

E-mail address: wjyan@bnu.edu.cn